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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 7, 2011

3. REQUEST FOR NEW BUSINESS:
   a. TA Scholars Program

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. Faculty Parental Benefits - Leaves (revised Policy 6-315)

9. DEBATE CALENDAR:
   a. Major in Ethnic Studies
   b. Part-time Regular Faculty (new Policy 6-320, revised 6-300, 6-314)

10. INFORMATION CALENDAR:
    a. Emphasis for Chemistry
    b. Emphasis for Geology and Geophysics
    c. Undergraduate Review – Behavioral Science and Health Program

11. NEW BUSINESS:

12. ADJOURNMENT:
ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
March 7, 2011

Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on March 7, 2011, was called to order at 3:01 pm by James E. Metherall, Senate President. The meeting was held in room 115 C. Roland Christensen Center.

Roll:

Excused:  Sara Schneider, Ryan Morrison, Henryk Hecht, Steve Carson, David Blair, Vladimir Hlady, David Viskochil

Ex-officio:  Paul Brinkman, Robert Flores, John Francis, Pat Hanna, Nancy Lines, James Metherall, Susan Olson, Jack Brittain, Octavio Villalpando, Michael K. Young

Others:  Ann Floor, Joanne Yaffe, Phyllis Vetter, Nan Ellin, Syndi Haywood, Amy Wildermuth

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting on February 7, 2011, were approved following a motion from Larry DeVries which was seconded by Jim Anderson.

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

Consent Calendar
The resignations, retirements, faculty appointments, auxiliary and limited term appointments, appearing in the Appendices dated February 28, 2011, received approval to forward to the Board of Trustees following a motion from Bob Fujinami and which was seconded by Jim Anderson.
Executive Committee Report
Pat Hanna, Executive Committee Secretary, summarized her written report of the February 7, 2011, Executive Committee meeting.

Report from Administration
President Michael Young reminded the Senate that Graduation is scheduled with Mitch Albom, author of the bestselling biography in history, Tuesdays with Morey, as the speaker and extended an invitation for all to join him. The President then provided an update on the Legislative session which should be finalized today. The budget which was initially thought to be a 7 percent cut has been backfilled to approximately a 1.5 to 3 percent budget cut. He

Other issues included a piece on fire arms which has no impact on the University’s policies, additional requirements for in-state tuition for undocumented students who have graduated from Utah high schools were removed, Capital Infrastructure projects requests most likely will not be funded, a bill requiring all repairs and renovation projects be brought before the Legislature has been modified to the U’s advantage, the reporting requirements for KUED was satisfied as it already exists, and finally, the removal of tenure went down to defeat. The President praised the success of Jason Perry for his efforts in this Legislative session. President Young also responded to a question regarding salary increases indicating they will not come from the State budget but other avenues are being discussed.

Report from ASUU
Chase Jardine, ASUU President, noted that student elections are underway. The main goal for this year was to reach out to the students. They launched a marketing campaign which has nearly doubled from a year ago. The student group leadership was restructured and requests for student group funding amounted to over $200,000. The student group leadership forums were re-established and the first discussion featured President Young as the speaker.

The annual Rock the U fund raiser for the Huntsman Cancer Foundation is scheduled for Friday, March 11 and the hope is to better the $20,000 total from last year.

Notice of Intent
New Policy 6-320 (and revised Policies 6-314 and 6-300) concerning Part-Time Regular Faculty and Librarians was explained by Susan Olson, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Joann Yaffe, former chair of the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women. The new policy provides clarification and elaboration regarding how to deal with unexpected issues of part-time faculty. The policy provides three alternative arrangements for faculty needing to balance work and family needs while also improving the University’s ability to recruit and retain the best faculty. The most difficult issue appeared to be the extension of the tenure clock during the probationary period. A lengthy discussion ensued with many questions being addressed. Any questions or concerns should be directed to Susan Olson or Joanne Yaffe.

Debate Calendar
Dan McCool, Environmental Studies Program Director, addressed the request for the name change for the Environmental Studies Program. The new name will be Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program. Dr. McCool indicated that adding sustainability more accurately
reflects what the students study and is the trend in academia as a whole. A motion to forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval was made by Larry DeVries and seconded by Jim Anderson received unanimous approval.

Nan Ellin, City and Metropolitan Planning, gave a short précis on the request for an Interdisciplinary Graduate Certificate in Urban Design. She indicated that this program is an interdisciplinary effort between Architecture and City and Metropolitan Planning and would build a bridge with architecture nationally and locally. Urban Design is a growing program and very much in demand. Chris Nelson made a motion to approve the request and forward to the Board of Trustees for final approval which was seconded by Jim Anderson and approved unanimously.

Jack Brittain, Vice President for Technology Venture Development, gave a synopsis of their request for transcript acknowledgement for the Undergraduate Innovation Scholars Program. The program would allow students to design a path for learning more about Big Problems and Big Ideas and propose innovative solutions allowing them a personalized case study to enhance graduate school applications and job interviews. It would also give the University leverage in innovation for recruiting and engagement. A Steering Committee representing the deans would advise and steer the program which Tech Ventures would administer. A motion from Norm Waitzman to award $1,000 to each successful innovation scholar was defeated. A motion from Jim Anderson to table the request was also defeated. A motion to accept the amendment to put the governance with the Undergraduate Studies Office for assembling the Steering Committee after consulting the deans and department chairs amending the language appropriately was made by David Bjorkland, seconded by Steve Alder and approved. A motion from Chris Nelson to approve as amended was seconded by Karl Lins and approved.

Information Calendar
The information calendar was announced and accepted. Paul Brinkman, Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning, gave a short synopsis of the annual Faculty Complement explaining the various tables indicating who taught courses within the University. Jim Metherall complimented the Vice President on his diligence in providing this report and all he has done for the University and wished him well in his future retirement.

New Business
There was no new business.

Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Lines
The Center for Teaching & Learning Excellence (CTLE) TA Scholars Program

The TA Scholars Program consists of an interdisciplinary cohort of outstanding graduate students. Over the course of two semesters, the TA Scholars meet to explore various pedagogical issues. Each TA Scholar develops an individual project that addresses a specific teaching or learning need of his or her department.

Please visit our poster presentation, held on Monday April 4th from 2:30-5:30 pm in the CRCC foyer. The TA Scholars will be available to discuss their projects with you and answer any questions you may have.

Projects for 2010-2011:

**Asad Hasan Sahir** (Chemical Engineering)  
*“Inspirations for Innovation” – Development of a course framework for undergraduate students*  
Faculty Mentors: JoAnn S. Lighty & Terry A. Ring (Chemical Engineering)

**Kevin C. Marrett** (Mechanical Engineering)  
*Quality Control of TA-led Instruction*  
Faculty Mentor: Rob Stoll (Mechanical Engineering)

**Kijoung Na** (Asian Studies)  
*Wake Up! : Extending the attention span of students via media presentation of scenes from the natural environment*  
Faculty Mentor: David S. Derezotes (Social Work)

**Tan Leng Goh** (Exercise and Sport Science)  
*Physical Education and Science come Together*  
Faculty Mentor: James Hannon (Exercise and Sport Science)

**Trina Valdez** (Education, Leadership, & Policy)  
*“Equity, Access and Social Justice”: An introductory course*  
Faculty Mentor: Paula Smith (Education, Leadership, & Policy)

For full project descriptions and more information about the TA Scholars program, please visit [http://www.ctle.utah.edu/TAScholars](http://www.ctle.utah.edu/TAScholars). We will be accepting applications for the 2011-2012 cohort until April 15.
APPENDIX I

RESIGNATIONS, RETIREMENTS & APPOINTMENTS

Resignations

1. Dr. Jana Bingman, Instructor (Clinical) in Psychiatry, effective February 8, 2011.

2. Dr. Steven M. Joyce, Professor (Clinical) of Surgery, effective February 19, 2011.

3. Dr. Michael E. Matlak, Professor (Clinical) of Pediatrics and of Surgery, effective June 30, 2011.

4. Dr. Reid J. Robison, Instructor of Psychiatry, effective January 31, 2011.

5. Dr. Shashirekha Shetty, Assistant Professor (Clinical) of Pathology, effective May 31, 2011.

Retirements

1. Professor Peter B. Atherton, Professor (Lecturer) in the School of Architecture, member of faculty for 37 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)

2. Dr. Robert Benedict, Associate Professor with tenure of Political Science, member of faculty for 36 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)

3. Dr. Penny S. Brook, Professor with tenure of Nursing, member of faculty for 37 years, effective July 1, 2011.

4. Dr. Raymond Gesteland, Distinguished Professor with tenure of Human Genetics and of Biology, member of faculty for 27 years, effective January 1, 2011.

5. Dr. James W. Gibb, Professor with tenure of Pharmacology & Toxicology, member of faculty for 44 years, effective July 1, 2011.

6. Dr. Grafton Hull, Professor (Lecturer) of Social Work, member of faculty for 11 years, effective April 1, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)

7. Dr. Ann P. Hutton, Assistant Professor with tenure of Nursing, member of faculty for 41 years, effective July 1, 2011.

8. Dr. Richard D. Jarrard, Professor with tenure of Geology & Geophysics, member of faculty for 20 years, effective July 1, 2011.
9. Dr. Kirtly P. Jones, Professor with tenure of Obstetrics & Gynecology, member of faculty for 28 years, effective August 15, 2011.

10. Dr. Wen H. Kuo, Professor with tenure of Sociology, member of faculty for 39 years, effective July 1, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)

11. Professor Bonita K. Lantz, Associate Professor (Lecturer) of Social Work, member of faculty for 19 years, effective August 15, 2011.

12. Dr. Harris R. Lenowitz, Professor with tenure of Languages & Literature, member of faculty for 39 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)

13. Dr. Scott M. Linscott Jr., Professor (Clinical) of Surgery, member of faculty for 28 years, effective July 1, 2011.

14. Professor William J. Lockhart, Professor with tenure of Law, member of faculty for 47 years, effective July 1, 2011.

15. Dr. Laurence D. Loeb, Associate Professor with tenure of Anthropology, member of faculty for 38 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)

16. Dr. Thomas E. Malloy, Associate Professor with tenure of Psychology, member of faculty for 43 years, effective July 1, 2011.

17. Professor William C. Miller, Professor with tenure in the School of Architecture, member of faculty for 19 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)

18. Dr. Royce Moser Jr., Professor (Clinical) of Family & Preventive Medicine, member of faculty for 26 years, effective July 1, 2011.

19. Dr. Frank J. Oneill, Associate Professor with tenure of Oncological Sciences, member of faculty for 40 years, effective August 15, 2011.

20. Professor David Roy Pendell, Professor with tenure of Art & Art History, member of faculty for 34 years, effective July 1, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)

21. Dr. Ronald O. Ragsdale, Professor with tenure of Chemistry, member of faculty for 48 years, effective August 15, 2011.

22. Dr. James R. Scott, Professor with tenure of Obstetrics & Gynecology, member of faculty for 34 years, effective July 1, 2011.

23. Dr. James T. Svendsen, Associate Professor with tenure of Languages & Literature, member of faculty for 42 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)
24. Dr. Joel A. Thompson, Professor with tenure of Pediatrics and Associate Professor with tenure of Neurology, member of faculty for 36 years, effective August 1, 2011.

25. Dr. Arthur C. Traub, Associate Professor with tenure of Psychiatry, member of faculty for 43 years, effective July 1, 2011.

26. Professor Henry Wolking Jr., Professor with tenure of Music, member of faculty for 39 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Emeritus Appointments)

27. Dr. Yong-Shi Wu, Distinguished Professor with tenure of Physics & Astronomy, member of faculty for 27 years, effective July 1, 2011.

28. Dr. Paul C. Young, Professor with tenure of Pediatrics, member of faculty for 19 years, effective July 1, 2011.

29. Ms. Mary E. Youngkin, Librarian with continuing appointment in the Eccles Health Sciences Library, member of faculty for 25 years, effective June 30, 2011.

**Administrative Appointments**

1. Dr. Isabel Moreira, Chair, Department of History, effective July 1, 2011.

2. Dr. Arthur C. Nelson, Director, Metropolitan Research Center, effective March 1, 2011.

3. Professor Ryan E. Smith, Director, Integrated Technology in Architecture Center, effective March 1, 2011.

**Faculty Appointment**

1. Dr. Keith Koper, Associate Professor with tenure of Geology and Geophysics, effective June 16, 2010.

   B.A., 1993, Northwestern University
   Ph.D., 1998, Washington University

**APPENDIX II**

**AUXILIARY FACULTY APPOINTMENTS**

**Auxiliary Faculty Appointments**

None at this time.
APPENDIX III

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS

Emeritus Appointments

1. Professor Peter B. Atherton, Professor (Lecturer) Emeritus in the School of Architecture, member of faculty for 37 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)

2. Dr. Robert Benedict, Associate Professor Emeritus of Political Science, member of faculty for 36 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)

3. Dr. Karen Brennan, Professor Emerita of English, member of faculty for 18 years, effective January 2, 2011.

4. Dr. Grafton Hull, Professor (Lecturer) Emeritus of Social Work, member of faculty for 11 years, effective April 1, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)

5. Dr. Ibrahim Karawan, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, member of faculty for 24 years, effective January 2, 2011.

6. Dr. Wen H. Kuo, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, member of faculty for 39 years, effective July 1, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)

7. Dr. Harris R. Lenowitz, Professor Emeritus of Languages & Literature, member of faculty for 39 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)

8. Dr. Laurence D. Loeb, Associate Professor Emeritus Anthropology, member of faculty for 38 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)

9. Professor William C. Miller, Professor Emeritus in the School of Architecture, member of faculty for 19 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)

10. Professor David Roy Pendell, Professor Emeritus of Art & Art History, member of faculty for 34 years, effective July 1, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)

11. Dr. James T. Svendsen, Associate Professor Emeritus of Languages & Literature, member of faculty for 42 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)

12. Professor Henry Wolking Jr., Professor Emeritus of Music, member of faculty for 39 years, effective June 30, 2011. (See Retirement Appointments)
Checklist & coversheet form—for submitting to Academic Senate Executive Committee

Proposal for addition/revision of University Regulation.

1. Regulation(s) involved (type, number, subject): **revised Policy 6-315 (Faculty Parental Benefits—Leaves of Absence with Modified Duties and Review Extensions)**

2. Responsible Policy Officer (name & title): **Sr. VP’s David Pershing & Lorris Betz**

3. Contact person(s) for questions & comments (name, email, phone#): **Susan Olson, Assoc.**

**V.P. Academic Affairs, susan.olson@utah.edu, 581-8763**

4. Presenter to Senate Exec (if different from contact person. name, phone#): 

5. Approvals & consultation status.

   a. Administrative Officers who have approved (VP/President, name & date): **Sr. VP’s Pershing & Betz, Pres. Young**


6. Check **YES** or **NA** (not applicable) of documents submitted— (In digital form. Preferred file format MS Word doc. Special exception allowed for PDF format if previously arranged.)

   **Yes** Explanatory memorandum (key points of proposal, rationale).

   **YES** VP/Presidential approval signatures (separate sheet, or affixed to memo cover).

   **Yes** Text of proposed Regulation addition/revision.

   **Yes** (If revision of existing Regulation) text changes are clearly marked, using permanent font markings (not MS Word ‘Track’ Changes non-permanent markings).

Date submitted to Senate Office: **Feb. 22, 2011**

The Executive Committee will consider whether the proposal is ready for presentation to the full Senate, and if so will schedule it for a subsequent Senate meeting either as i) a matter of academic significance—set on the “Intent” & “Debate” Calendars over two monthly meetings with final “approval” voting at the second, or ii) not academically significant—set on the “Information” Calendar for a single monthly meeting, with opportunity for questions and recommendations. See Policy 1-001 http://www.regulations.utah.edu/general/1-001.html ; Rule 1-001 http://www.regulations.utah.edu/general/rules/R1-001.html ; Senate procedures http://www.admin.utah.edu/asenate/index.html . Further information-- Senate Office: Nancy Lines 581-5203 nancy.lines@utah.edu.
SUBJECT: Review of Parental Leave and Proposed Revisions to Policy 6-315

University Policy 6-315 on Faculty Parental Leaves of Absence for all colleges except the School of Medicine was adopted in 2006 and revised in 2007. The Policy included a commitment to conduct a review after three years. That review has now been conducted, somewhat delayed to take advantage of an opportunity to have the Utah Education Policy Center ("UEPC") conduct research of a far more comprehensive scope than otherwise would have been feasible. We now present both the results of that UEPC research, and a proposal for revising Policy 6-315 based on information gleaned from the UEPC research as well as four and one-half years’ experience administering the existing Policy.

In this memo we briefly highlight the findings of the UEPC evaluation and summarize the proposed revisions to Policy 6-315.

The UEPC project was carried out during 2010 by Associate Professor Andrea Rorrer, and Ph.D. student Jennifer Allie, who has both professional experience with and a scholarly interest in parental leaves.


An Executive Summary of the UEPC evaluation is attached and is also available online. ([http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/UU-Parental%20Leave-UEPC%20Exec%20Summary-%202011-01-18.pdf](http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/UU-Parental%20Leave-UEPC%20Exec%20Summary-%202011-01-18.pdf))

The proposed revisions to Policy 6-315 and the new application form are attached. The existing Policy may be seen online. ([http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-315.html](http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-315.html))

Highlights of the UEPC Evaluation

The UEPC team gathered data regarding the University community’s experience with the parental leaves policy by using web-based surveys, focus groups, and interviews.
Survey respondents at-large and those who volunteered for focus groups overwhelmingly supported the policy and its use and believed the policy was being fairly used. Respondents, who included individual faculty who had taken the leave, those who planned to take the leave, and those who neither had nor planned to take the leave, perceived that their peers also generally supported use of the policy. According to participants, the policy appeared to be helpful in retaining women and younger faculty members. On the other hand, the policy is still not sufficiently well known on campus. Even among faculty who reported a birth or adoption event at a time relevant for this policy, 38% were unaware of the policy.

Several other issues regarding the use of the parental leave policy surfaced in the evaluation. First, faculty members who have used the leave perceived themselves as having done more university-related work during the leave than unit administrators perceived faculty to have done. Second, guidance on the nature and expectations of the modified duties is needed for faculty and academic units. Next, department administrators would like to get more resources from central administration to cover replacement costs. Fourth, it may be beneficial to instruct external and internal RPT reviewers more explicitly how to take a parental leave or tenure clock extension into consideration in assessing a record. Finally, there may be a need to ensure fair play in decisions by some academic units to pay the full amount of salary rather than the 95% guaranteed in the policy, to attain consistency within (and possibly across) departments.

While the response rate (15%) to the survey was not high, 185 faculty members responded. Of those who responded to the survey, 73% had not had a qualifying event since 2006 when the parental leave policy was adopted. Though the response rate was not as high as the researchers worked for, they concluded that a low response rate is not equivocal to nonresponse bias, particularly when the responders reflect the possible survey pool. The researchers recognized that the overall response rate for this survey was likely impacted by several circumstances common to organizational research and evaluation, including misalignment of topic with faculty interest, immediate need or ability to provide data, use of web-based survey, and busy and already over obligated faculty. Despite the lower response rate, the researchers are confident that the data is sufficient to demonstrate the lack of strong negative feelings about the policy as well as the support for it. Questions were included to give respondents an opportunity to voice opposition, if they chose. Indifference to the policy, manifested as not bothering to respond to the survey, suggests it has become an accepted feature of the University.

Proposed Revisions to Policy 6-315

The attached revision of the policy has been extensively reorganized to conform to the new format of University Regulations adopted in 2008, and to make its provisions clearer. The provisions applicable to leaves of absence with modified duties and to extensions of the RPT probationary period are separated to make clearer that an eligible faculty member may take either one without the other or both. To close the gap between the perceptions of the faculty member and the unit leader about what work faculty are doing while on leave, faculty members will be encouraged to submit a written statement of the duties they expect to continue, if any during a leave of absence with modified duties.
Probably the most important proposed revision would extend the amount of time in which a faculty member who requested time off but deferred a request for a tenure clock extension is allowed to make that decision. The reason for allowing a deferred decision at all is that especially first-time parents may under-estimate the time demands of having a child. The policy currently requires that a decision on whether to extend the clock be made within three months after the child’s arrival. Feedback suggests that in those first three months the new parent may be so focused on the baby that the faculty member could easily forget about that deadline. The proposed revision would allow a decision about requesting a tenure-clock extension to be made in the six months following the child’s arrival or before the steps begin for the first formal review following the leave of absence, whichever is earlier.

Another revision would change the nomenclature of and clarify the definition of a faculty member eligible for benefits based on being a care-giver. What has been termed “primary care-giver” would be changed to a more neutral term, “eligible care-giver.” Following the advice of Compliance Accounting office, the policy does not state an exact number of hours of care-giving, but requires providing “the majority of child contact hours during the faculty member’s regular academic working hours for a period of at least 15 weeks” to be eligible for a leave and “the majority of child contact hours during time that the faculty member would normally spend on productive scholarly pursuits for a period of at least 15 weeks” to be eligible for a tenure clock extension. (The latter covers faculty members who give birth during the summer, who would not be eligible for a leave, but who lose valuable time they would otherwise be working on research and so should be able to have a clock extension.)

The proposed new language, developed in discussion with the Senate Executive Committee, would add: “Factors that may be considered in applying the child contact hours eligibility requirement include: (i) the faculty member is a single parent with 50% or greater custody, or (ii) although both parents reside with the child the other parent is unavailable to provide the majority of contact hours (e.g., full-time school or employment), and (iii) the child is not primarily placed in childcare during the faculty member’s working hours. ” Adding this would give potential applicants fair notice of factors taken into account by the senior vice presidents’ offices for determining that the applicant will be providing the required majority of care-giving. These factors will also be mentioned in the application form.

The provision on unbalanced teaching loads is changed to read: “A faculty member with a one semester leave should generally teach one-half of a normal load, overall for an academic year. When the teaching load cannot be exactly halved, it is permissible to expect the faculty member to teach the larger portion. For example, if a faculty member normally teaches three courses per year, s/he may be released from one and asked to teach two. “

Finally, in response to a concern raised through the UEPC research, a change is made so that any academic units which choose to provide compensation above 95% during a leave period must now do so in such a way that “similarly situated faculty in the same unit are treated consistently.”
Conclusion

The Executive Summary of the UEPC policy review and the proposed policy revisions in substance have been circulated to the deans and department chairs and to the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women for feedback, and reviewed by the Institutional Policy Committee. If you and President Young approve the revisions, they will proceed to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and then the full Senate and Board of Trustees.
Policy 6-315: Faculty Parental Benefits—Leaves of Absence with Modified Duties and Review Extensions. Revision 1.2 [Effective date March 12, 2007 ??? July 1, 2011]

I. Purpose and Scope

To outline establish the University’s Policy for parental leaves of absence and extensions of the review timetable for the birth or adoption of children by regular faculty and academic librarians. To maintain the University’s general preference of providing leaves for faculty, except for brief absences, in increments of an academic term or semester, consistent with the length of most teaching assignments. Any questions regarding this policy should be referred to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Office of the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences.

II. Scope and Effective Date

This policy applies for academic librarians and regular faculty in all colleges except the School of Medicine. The effective date of this policy is July 1, 2006.

III. References {Drafting note: References are moved to Part V below, without changes.}

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

   A. “Academic year” is defined for purposes of this policy as August 16 to May 15 for faculty on nine-month appointments and July 1 to June 30 for faculty on twelve-month appointments.

   B. "Adopted child" refers to a child under six years of age or a special needs child (as defined here) placed for adoption. “Special needs child” means a child under the age of 18 who is incapable of self-care on a daily basis because of a mental or physical disability that substantially limits one or more major life activities. {Drafting note: this ‘special’ needs definition is merely moved below without changes.}

   C. "Annual base salary" means the total compensation approved in advance as the amount payable to a faculty member for normal and expected working time and effort, not in excess of 100% of full-time, for all services to be performed under all assignments during the appointment period. This term does not include compensation for separate assignments during nonworking intervals, approved overload assignments in the Division of Continuing Education, additional compensation for occasional services or payments made pursuant to authorized consulting or professional service contracts. (See Policy 5-403, Additional Compensation and Overload Policy.)

   D. "Eligible faculty" is defined as library faculty or regular faculty with appointments that began before the expected arrival of a child.
E. "Library faculty” is defined as academic librarians with continuing appointment or eligible for continuing appointment under Policy 6-300.

F. “Parental benefits” refers to both the leave of absence benefits and the review extension benefits provided under this Policy. “Parental leave benefits” refers to parental leaves of absence with modified duties (including disability leaves for birth mothers and care-giving leaves for all eligible caregiver parents) and/or extensions of the review timetable for the birth or adoption of children.

G. “Partner” refers to a spouse or, in the case of unmarried faculty, to an adult who is certified as an eligible partner through Human Resources procedures.

H. “Eligible caregiver” is defined differently for purposes of each type of parental benefit. (1) “Eligible caregiver” for purposes of a care-giving leave means a faculty member who provides the majority of child contact hours during the faculty member’s regular academic working hours for a period of at least 15 weeks. (2) "Primary-Eligible caregiver" for purposes of an extension of the review timetable means a faculty member who provides the majority of child contact hours during time that the faculty member would normally spend on productive scholarly pursuits for a period of at least 15 weeks. This definition takes into account typical summertime scholarly activities. "Primary caregiver" for purposes of a care-giving leave means a faculty member who provides the majority of child contact hours during the faculty member’s regular academic working hours for a period of at least 15 weeks.

{Option---factors for caregiver eligibility. On recommendation of the Senate Executive Committee, the following is presented as an option for the Senate to include as an addition, or not.

Factors that may be considered in applying the child contact hours eligibility requirement include: (i) the faculty member is a single parent with 50% or greater custody, or (ii) although both parents reside with the child the other parent is unavailable to provide the majority of contact hours (e.g., full-time school or employment), and (iii) the child is not primarily placed in childcare during the faculty member's working hours.}

I. "Regular faculty” is defined as tenured or tenure-eligible faculty under Policy 6-300.

J. “Review timetable extension” refers to an additional year added to the probationary period before a tenure or post-tenure review.

K. “Special needs child” means a child under the age of 18 who is incapable of self-care on a daily basis because of a mental or physical disability that substantially limits one of more major life activities.

V. Faculty Parental Leave: Eligibility, NOTIFICATION, BENEFITS

A. Eligibility

1. Review timetable extensions under this policy are available to an eligible faculty member who either i) is due to and/or does give birth to a child no later than June 30 of
the year in which the review to be extended is scheduled, or ii) is planning to and/or begins to serve as the primary caregiver of her or his own newborn child or a partner’s newborn child or of a newly adopted child no later than June 30 of the year in which the review to be extended is scheduled.

2. Disability leave benefits and the resulting modified duties under this policy are available to an eligible faculty member who gives birth to a child within the semester for which leave is sought or within four weeks before the beginning of that semester.

3. Care-giving leave benefits and the resulting modified duties under this policy are available to an eligible faculty member who serves as the primary caregiver of her or his own newborn child or a partner’s newborn child or of a newly adopted child within the semester for which leave is sought.

4. This policy does not apply to birth mothers who do not anticipate becoming the legal parent of the child following birth. In such cases, the faculty member may be covered by sick leave and FMLA policies.

5. Disability or care-giving leave under this policy shall begin no more than three months prior to the birth/placement of a child and shall be completed no more than 12 months following the birth/placement.

6. Only one University of Utah faculty member is guaranteed to qualify for parental leave benefits for a given instance of childbirth or adoption. {Note—An explanation of coordination this policy with the School of Medicine policy will be added here, once the SOM policy is in final form.} The qualifying faculty member is only guaranteed one semester of leave with modified duties for a given instance of childbirth or adoption.

7. A faculty member will automatically receive parental leave

III. Policy

A. General eligibility for benefits

1. An eligible faculty member is guaranteed parental benefits no more than twice. Any subsequent requests for benefits in conjunction with additional instances of birth or adoption will be subject to the approval of the cognizant senior vice president.

2. Only one University of Utah faculty member is guaranteed to qualify for parental benefits for a given instance of childbirth or adoption. {Note—An explanation of coordination this policy with the School of Medicine policy will be added here, once the revised SOM policy is in final form. The Benefits application form provided by the VP’s office will include information for implementing the limit that if both parents are U employees, ordinarily only one may claim the benefits.}

3. This policy does not apply to birth parents who do not anticipate becoming the legal parent of the child following birth. In such cases, a birth mother may be covered by sick leave and FMLA policies.

4. Exceptions to these and other eligibility criteria below must be approved by the cognizant senior vice president.
B. Notification

1. An eligible faculty member should
   a. Complete the Parental Benefits application form and submit it to the
cognizant senior vice president. [link to form]
   b. Notify her or his department chairperson and dean of the application as
soon as possible when the application is submitted.

2. A request for a parental leave of absence with modified duties should normally
be made no fewer than three months prior to the expected arrival of the child.
   a. A request for a parental leave of absence with modification of duties as soon as
possible and normally no fewer than three months prior to the expected arrival of
the child. A request for a review timetable extension may be made at the same time
and must be made within three months after the arrival of the child and before
external reviewers are solicited or other action is taken to begin a formal review,
which is earlier. A Parental Leave application form is available. A previously
submitted request for a timetable extension may be revoked by written notice from
the faculty member, submitted before the date on which action would ordinarily be
taken to begin a formal review in that year’s review cycle. [drafting note: the right
to revoke is merely moved to below]

C. Parental Leaves of Absence With Modified Duties

1. Eligibility for leave
   a. Disability leave benefits and the resulting modified duties under this
policy are available to an eligible faculty member who gives birth to a child
during the semester for which leave is sought or within four weeks before the
beginning of that semester
   b. Care-giving leave benefits and the resulting modified duties under this
policy are available to an eligible faculty member who serves as an eligible
caregiver (as defined for this purpose) of her or his own newborn child or a
partner’s newborn child or of a newly adopted child during the semester for
which leave is sought.

C. Parental Leaves of Absence, with Modified Duties (Disability Leave, Care-giving
Leave).

2. Benefit
   a. Upon approval of a parental leave of absence. Upon request, an eligible
faculty member will be granted a parental leave of absence with modified
duties (e.g., teaching, service, and/or research) for one semester for faculty
in nine-month appointments or an equivalent period for faculty on twelve-
month appointments.
      i. The faculty member will be released from professional duties
during this period, but may choose to continue some professional
activities (e.g., meeting students, doing research, participating in hiring
or RPT decisions).
ii. The faculty member who is released from teaching should not be expected to maintain normal scholarly productivity during a semester of modified duties.

iii. The faculty member is encouraged to provide the department chairperson with a written statement of the activities the faculty member intends to continue during the leave, if any (e.g., advising, committee service, and research).

b. The faculty member will receive pay at the rate of 95% of her or his annual base salary during that semester, unless the department or college chooses to supplement the salary above 95% (and any such supplementation must be applied consistently for all faculty members of that unit who take parental leave).

c. Portions of the faculty member’s compensation is received from grants or contracts, that portion of compensation must be based on actual effort performed for the award, and all award requirements must be met.

d. A faculty member with a one semester leave should generally teach one-half of a normal load, overall for an academic year. When the teaching load cannot be exactly halved, it is permissible to expect the faculty member to teach the larger portion. For example, if a faculty member normally teaches three courses per year, s/he may be released from one and asked to teach two. For teaching loads that are unbalanced across the academic year, arrangements should be coordinated wherever possible such that a leave with modified duties would coincide with the semester with fewer teaching duties.

e. Disability leave under this Policy shall begin no more than three months prior to the birth of the child and shall be completed at the end of the semester (or 12-week period) for which the leave is sought.

f. Care-giving leave under this Policy shall begin no sooner than the beginning of the semester in which the child arrives and shall be completed no more than 12 months following the arrival.

3. Parental Leave and the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA)

a. Parental leaves of absence with modified duties under this Policy are substituted for unpaid care-giving leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA).

b. Eligible faculty members may in addition qualify for unpaid leave under the FMLA during the same twelve (12) month period, but only in connection with a serious health condition either before or after the child’s birth or adoption or to the extent the faculty member has not received twelve (12) full weeks of care-giving leave.
Such FMLA leave is normally unpaid except that accrued sick leave must be used. See [Policy 5-200] for more information.

D. Extension to Review Timetables

Upon making a timely request, an eligible faculty member will automatically receive a one-year extension on her or his overall timetable for retention, promotion and tenure (RPT) or post-tenure reviews. For an RPT review, an extension applies both to the next scheduled review, and the overall timetable for subsequent reviews. An extension taken at any time in a pre-tenure probationary period will extend the date for the final tenure review, as well as any intervening formal review. Faculty members should not be expected to maintain normal scholarly productivity during an extension granted under this policy.

1. Eligibility for Extension.

A one-year extension of the pre-tenure probationary period (i.e., tenure clock) or the time before a post-tenure review is available to an otherwise eligible faculty member who either i) gives birth to a child, or ii) serves as an eligible caregiver (as defined for this purpose) of her or his own newborn child or a partner’s newborn child or of a newly adopted child.

2. Notice.

A request for a review timetable extension is made on the same Parental Benefits application form as a request for a parental leave. A request for an extension may be made at the same time as the request for leave and must be made within six months after the arrival of the child and before external reviewers are solicited or other action is taken to begin a formal review, whichever is earlier. [add link to Form]

3. Benefit

Upon approval of a request, a formal review in the current year will be postponed (a) if the faculty member (i) is due to and/or does give birth to a child no later than June 30 of the year in which the review to be extended is scheduled, or (ii) is planning to and/or begins to serve as an eligible caregiver to her or his own newborn child or a partner’s newborn child or of a newly adopted child no later than June 30 of the year in which the review to be extended is scheduled and (b) if the faculty member gives the department notice of the birth or adoption before the formal review is initiated. Births or adoptions after June 30 may extend a subsequent formal review, but not the review in the current year. An extension taken at any time in a pre-tenure probationary period will extend the date for the final tenure review.

4. A previously submitted request for a timetable extension may be revoked by written notice from the faculty member, submitted before the date on which action would ordinarily be taken to begin a formal review in that year’s review cycle.

E. Unanticipated Events

Not all events surrounding pregnancy, childbirth, adoption, and the health of a young child can be fully anticipated for purposes of this Policy. Requests for exceptions to this Policy should be directed to the cognizant senior vice president.
F. Obligation to Return

The obligation to return to University service following the leave, applicable to other leaves under Policy 6-314, Section 9.B, applies to disability and caregiving leaves under this Policy as well.

VI. Examples of Policy Application

Examples of the application of this policy are available at this link parental_leave_examples. Examples are provided for illustrative purposes only. They do not constitute any part of this policy. [Drafting Note: Examples link moved to IV below.]

VII. Relationship to Other Policies

A 1. Nothing in this Policy precludes academic units from providing similar benefits to faculty other than faculty eligible under this Policy or providing to any faculty members or academic librarians more extensive benefits for parental or other family responsibilities or personal disability, so long as similarly situated faculty in the same unit are treated consistently.

B 2. Other leave that has been taken or is scheduled to be taken by a faculty member shall not preclude eligibility for parental leave benefits under this Policy. Correspondingly, parental leave taken or scheduled under this Policy shall have no bearing on decisions regarding other leave for a faculty member, except to the extent that a faculty member with a twelve-month appointment is subject to a department policy regarding proration of sick leave, vacation leave or professional development leave.

C 3. If any other University Policy is inconsistent with the provisions herein, this Policy shall govern.

VIII. Policy Review

The implementation and the fiscal impact of this parental leave Policy will be reviewed in three years from the original date of passage which was May 2006 with an amendment in March 2007. The report will be given to the Academic Senate. Concerns should be reported to the cognizant Associate Vice President for Faculty or for Health Sciences.

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

Rules:

Procedures:

Guidelines: Examples of application of University Policy 6-315 [link to http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/parental_leave_examples.html] Examples are provided for illustrative purposes only. They do not constitute any part of this policy.

Forms: Parental Benefits Application Form [link]

Other related resource materials:

Executive Summary & Update  

Full Evaluation Report  

V. References

A. Policy 5-200, Leaves of Absence (Health-Related)
B. Policy 5-201, Leaves of Absence (Non Health-Related)
C. Policy 6-311, Faculty Retention and Tenure of Regular Faculty (extensions of pre-tenure probationary period for disability)
D. Policy 6-314, Leaves of Absence
E. Policy 8-002, School of Medicine (SOM) Faculty Parental Leaves of Absence
F. 29 Code of Federal Regulations 825.100 et seq., Family and Medical Leave Act

VI. Contacts:

Policy Owners: Questions about this Policy and any related Rules, Procedures and Guidelines should be directed to the Associate Vice President for Faculty and the Associate Vice President for Health Sciences.

Policy Officers: Acting as the Policy Officers, the Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Sr. Vice President for Health Science, are responsible for representing the University’s interests in enforcing this policy and authorizing any allowable exceptions.

VII. History:


Revision history:

A. Current version: Revision 2.
- Approved by Academic Senate: [_____]
- Approved by Board of Trustees: [_____]

B. Earlier versions:

1. Revision 1: Effective dates March 12, 2007 to [?? ___ July 1, 2011] [create a file with Revision 1, watermark stamp as outdated, link it here]
   - Approved by Academic Senate: March 5, 2007
   - Approved by Board of Trustees: March 12, 2007, with effective date of March 12, 2007

2. Revision 0.  Effective dates July 1, 2006 to March 11, 2007  [Link to http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/revisions_6/6-315.R0.pdf]
   - Background information for Revision 0.  [link to http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/appendices_6/6-315.R0-background.pdf]
Application for Faculty Parental Benefits Under Policy 6-315 and Concurrent FMLA Leave in Connection with Birth or Adoption

Applicant: After reviewing Policy 6-315, please check appropriate boxes, complete blanks, sign, and submit form as instructed below. (Note deadlines: A request for leave with modified duties= apply at least three months prior to child’s expected arrival (and also notify department chair as soon as possible of intent to request leave). An extension to the RPT period= apply within six months after child’s arrival and before any formal review actions begin. See details in 6-315.)

To: □ Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (205 Park)
    □ Senior Vice President for Health Sciences (5th floor, Bldg 550)

If questions, contact:
{Susan Olson, Academic Affairs, 581-8763, susan.olson@utah.edu}
Richard Sperry, Health Sciences, 581-5619, richard.sperry@hsc.utah.edu

Name (please print):__________________________________________________
Department:_____________________________________________________
Current Rank:_____________________________________________________
If tenured, year received:________________________
If untenured, first year of probationary period: _______________________

I hereby apply for benefits under the University’s parental benefits policy.

1. Eligibility. (a) The □ anticipated/ □ actual date of arrival of my child is/was (MM/DD/YY) ___.

(b) I am eligible for the requested benefits on this basis (check one)

□ (disability benefit) as a birth mother whose due date falls within the academic year or within four weeks before the beginning of the academic year.

□ (care-giving benefit) as the “eligible caregiver” for my or my partner’s newborn child or newly adopted child, and, by my signature below I attest that I will be providing the majority of child contact hours during my regular academic working hours for the period of at least 15 weeks during the leave, and I understand that factors considered in applying the child contact hours eligibility requirement may include: (i) the faculty member is a single parent with 50% or greater custody, or (ii) although both parents reside with the child the other parent is unavailable to provide the majority of contact hours (e.g., full-time school or employment), and (iii) the child is not primarily placed in childcare during the faculty member’s working hours.
Please describe in more detail how these factors do/do not apply in your case and why you will qualify as the eligible caregiver: [_______________________________]

(c) Coordination of eligibility for two employees, I understand that under Policies 6-315 and 8-002 (School of Medicine faculty), if two parents of a child are University employees, only one parent is guaranteed eligibility for parental benefits with regard to that child’s birth/adoption.

Please (i) explain whether the child’s other parent is a University faculty member/librarian potentially eligible for parental benefits under either 6-315 or 8-002, and if so (ii) provide that parent’s name and title and University ID number, and confirm that only you and not the other parent will obtain University-provided parental benefits.

[___________________________________]

2. Leave with modification of duties

☐ I am not requesting a leave with modification of duties.

☐ I request a leave with modification of duties for (mark one):

(9-month faculty) the (Fall, Spring) _____ semester of ______(yr).

(12-month faculty) from (MM/DD/YY) __ (date) to (MM/DD/YY) __ (date).

I understand that under Policy 6-315 I will receive only 95% of my base salary for the leave semester (unless my department/college provides an additional supplement). I will inform the payroll administrator how the reduction should be spread across the year. I also understand that this leave carries an obligation to return to University service for at least one semester.

3. Extension of period for pre- or post-tenure review. (Note deadline: Extension requests must be made before external reviewers are solicited to begin a formal review or within six months after arrival of the child, whichever is earlier.)

☐ I request a one-year extension of my review period.

☐ At this time, I am not requesting an extension, but I may later do so, before the deadline noted above.

☐ I do not request an extension.

4. Applicant’s signature, submission of original application, and notification of department chair & academic dean:

Applicant’s signature ___________________________ Application date (MM/DD/YY)

(MM/DD/YY)
Applicant instructions: Submit signed original of the form, with above parts completed, directly to office of the senior vice president. Check box to indicate that you have, or within two business days will provide a copy of the signed form to:

___ Department Chair, and
___ Academic Dean

5. Departmental signature(s), department/college supplement of salary

Department chair instructions: When you receive a copy of the application, please sign the form (and if a semester of leave has been requested, also check the appropriate box regarding salary reduction/contribution and have your payroll administrator sign the form). Send a copy with your signatures to the office of the vice president. The VP’s office will return a copy of the fully completed form to you and the dean.

Percentage of Salary During Semester of Leave with Modified Duties (if applicable)

☐ For the semester of leave with modified duties the applicant will receive only 95% of her/his salary, as provided under Policy 6-315 (i.e., there will be a 5% reduction of salary for that semester).

☐ The department/college will supplement the applicant’s salary by contributing an additional ____%, making the total salary for the leave semester ____% of normal.

(MM/DD/YY)

Chair’s name
Signature
Date

Instructions for Payroll administrator: If the applicant is taking a semester of leave, note carefully whether the applicant’s salary for that leave semester will be reduced to 95% (as per Policy 6-315), or will be supplemented to a higher percentage by the department/college. If there is a reduction, the applicant should inform you how the reduction should be allocated across semesters. Because faculty members are usually paid on a 9/12 contract, please plan ahead when you know faculty members will be on parental leave, and process their pay as a 12 month annual or a 9 month annual if they have research funding for the summer, rather than a 9/12 contract. Sign below when such arrangements have been made. If you have any questions, please call Sandy Hughes @ 581-6455.
Payroll reporter/AA’s signature (if applicable) Date

6. Vice President’s Authorization for transfer of funds to department (for semester of leave)

Senior vice president or designee Date
2010

University of Utah
Parental Leave Policy Evaluation

Andrea K. Rorrer, Ph.D.
Jennifer L. Allie
Focus of Evaluation
Section VIII of University of Utah Policy 6-315 (Parental Leaves of Absence) provides the mandate for reviewing both the implementation and fiscal impacts of the University’s parental leave policy. In this evaluation, implementation and interpretation of University of Utah Policy 6-315 – “Faculty Parental Leaves of Absence” from a multi-level perspective (individual, departmental, and institutional) were considered. This evaluation addressed the implementation of parental leave on the main campus and excludes evaluation of the School of Medicine. The formal evaluation of the School of Medicine Parental Leave policy (8-002) is anticipated to conclude Fall 2010.

Evaluation Design and Methods
This evaluation addressed both the implementation and impact of the parental leave policy on campus. Specifically, we addressed the following evaluation questions:

1. What are the experiences of faculty who have taken parental leave?
2. What are the perceptions of faculty and leadership of the parental leave policy?
   a. To what degree do faculty value the current benefits provided by the parental leave policy in comparison to other benefits?
   b. Do faculty and leadership differ in their opinions on how the parental leave policy has been utilized and implemented?
   c. Are there differences among subgroups of faculty in how they value benefits?
   d. Does leadership vary in their opinions according to their actual experience with parental leave utilization and implementation?
3. How has the parental leave policy been implemented?

To address questions regarding the implementation and impact of parental leave on campus, this evaluation included a mixed method design. Data collected and analyzed for this evaluation included web-based surveys from faculty (N=185) and leadership (N=15), focus groups and interviews (N=16). Of those who responded to the survey, 48 had a qualifying event in which they could have used parental leave. Thirty respondents had used parental leave. Twelve survey respondents who had taken leave had an RPT review since their reported parental leave of absence.

Actual Use of Parental Leave Benefit 2006-2009
- According to the Office of Academic Affairs, 51 tenure track faculty have formally requested and been approved for parental leave benefits (73% female; 27% male) between the policy’s adoption in 2006 and December 31, 2009. During this time, 24 faculty have requested a one year extension to their tenure clock. Eight did not request a tenure clock extension (9 were tenured prior to use and 9 were pre-tenure), and 8 opted to
retain their right to extend the tenure clock.

- Actual institutional funds distributed for this purpose during the 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 academic years totals $147,000, reflecting an average of .01% of total institutional budget per academic year.

**Overview of Findings**

Overwhelmingly, survey respondents and interviewees recommend use of the policy to others on tenure track.

- Most participants reported that the department chair (44%) followed by a peer (37%) provided information relative to the parental leave policy upon disclosure of birth/adoptions.

- 38% of faculty who reported a qualifying event indicated that they were not aware of the policy.

- Leadership who had more experience with the policy saw it as more valuable in retaining faculty, more equitably utilized, and better supported by faculty in their respective department compared to those leaders without policy experience.

- Respondents indicate that generally their peers were highly supportive of their use of the parental leave.

- Women, assistant professors, and associate professors agreed that the parental leave policy influenced their personal decision to remain at the University.

- Teaching replacement costs are viewed as essential, but currently insufficient given average teaching loads and replacement costs.

- 70% of leadership respondents indicated that they would prefer more assistance from central administration rather than to impose additional direct costs on faculty members by reducing their salaries further during leave.

- 90% of faculty respondents who used parental leave selected the provision of modified duties.
The percent of faculty or leadership who report that the parental leave is referenced in offer letters (1% and 7% respectively) or formally discussed in RPT reviews (16% and 20% respectively) is minimal.

According to the survey, both faculty and leadership agreed that parental leave helps women obtain tenure.

Conditions that influenced the request for and use of the parental leave policy, as well as its provisions, included:

- Communication, dissemination and accessibility of policy, and visibility of use in department
- Formal departmental practices (e.g., department chair, recruitment, RPT, faculty retreats);
- Informal networks (e.g., peers and colleagues); and
- Institutional web-based policy library.

“Negotiation” of Modification of Duties (See reported modifications in Figure 1.)

- Individual negotiations based on circumstances arising from committee, student advising, and grant responsibilities;
- Identified departmental needs (e.g., student course needs, replacement costs);
• Service (e.g., faculty believed there was a need or expectation to be visible and engaged).

• Tenure and Promotion Extension Considerations
  • Record to date;
  • Proximity to tenure; and
  • Expectations for scholarly productivity (e.g., self expectations, departmental/peer expectations for “productivity” during parental leave).

• Faculty were aware of and sensitive to colleagues who are at different life stages or who did not have access to similar provisions.

• Faculty raised concerns for the impact (e.g., costs, time) on the department and or college.
Recommendations

Given the findings, we provide the following recommendations. These recommendations are intended to guide continued implementation of the University of Utah’s Parental Leave Policy.

1. Modify language in Parental Leave Policy 6-315 to increase clarity of intent and process.

2. Increase communication and dissemination of the parental leave policy and its provisions to faculty through formal channels (e.g., departmental retreats, recruitment offers) and informal channels (e.g., university-based networks).

3. Formalize a transparent departmental negotiation and recordkeeping process for designation of leave for faculty, modification of duties, and determination of tenure extension.

4. Embed a family-friendly culture at the departmental level, including timing of events that expect faculty participation, flexible work schedule, part-time off to care for sick/injured family members, and childcare.

5. Increase availability and access to early childcare and early childhood education on campus.

6. Develop guidelines for Departments/Colleges ability to expand the salary contribution beyond the provisions allowed for in the University’s current Parental Leave Policy, including who has the authority to grant additional benefits, under what conditions, and with which resources.

7. Develop “life-stage” policies that provide comparable leave for faculty and other employees who may have other family (e.g., elderly parent, sibling, or partner care) or life circumstances that require their time and attention.
February 15, 2011

TO: David Pershing
    Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR: John Francis
    Chair, Undergraduate Council

RE: Major in Ethnic Studies

At its meeting of Tuesday, January 25, 2011, the Undergraduate Council voted to approve a proposal from the Ethnic Studies program for new Major in Ethnic Studies. The proposal, along with letters of support, is attached.

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

University of Utah requests approval to offer Bachelors of Arts effective Fall 2011. This program has been approved by the institutional Board of Trustees on

Section II: Program Description

Complete Program Description

The proposed Ethnic Studies major (B.A. and B.S.) is a 33 unit of study that takes an interdisciplinary approach at examining the experiences and culture of the various ethnic and racial populations within the U.S. The program draws from jointly appointed faculty across the University of Utah campus to offer courses with insights about diverse communities. The disciplinary foci range from Education, English, History, Psychology, and Social Work. The degree will be managed by the Ethnic Studies Program (which has been serving the University of Utah since 1976), which is overseen by the Office of Associate Vice President of Equity and Diversity. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences will house the proposed degree as well as serve as the curriculum adoption apparatus for new course proposals.

The proposed major includes core, restrictive elective, and a capstone course. The core is composed of four elements, totaling 33 credit hours. This includes an introductory course that provides students with an overview of the various themes found in the program, one survey course focusing on the experiences of one U.S. ethnic/racial group, two theory courses that provide students with conceptual mooring of the various theories of race, ethnicity, and inequality, and one research methodology course that orients students to posing research questions and designing research. Students can then choose five elective courses from the Ethnic Study offerings. Of these, two of the five elective courses can come from other departments or programs that have recognized courses accepted by the Ethnic Studies program. Finally, there is a capstone course that links the various themes that the student encountered throughout the program. The ETHNC 2500 (introduction to Ethnic Studies) as well as the one survey course serves as the prerequisites for any of the 3000 level courses.

The distribution of lower to upper credit hours includes a total number of 6 lower division credit hours while the number of upper division credit hours required is 27.

Service learning will also constitute a key component in the major.

The proposed major consists for five components.

I. One required introductory course:
   - Ethnic Studies 2500 Introduction to Ethnic Studies (3 units)

II. One survey course from the various listings:
   - Ethnic Studies 2550 African American Experiences (3 units)
   - Ethnic Studies 2560 Chicana/o Experiences (3 units)
• Ethnic Studies 2570 American Indian Experiences (3 units)
• Ethnic Studies 2580 Asian Pacific American Experiences (3 units)
• Ethnic Studies 2590 Pacific Islander American Experiences (3 units)

III. Two Theory courses from the following

• Ethnic Studies 3420 American Racism (3 units)
• Ethnicities Studies 3010 Black Popular Culture (3 units)
• Ethnic Studies 4020 Black Feminist Thought (3 units)
• Ethnic Studies 4330 Chicana/o culture via media (3 units)
• Ethnic Studies 5250 Migration, diasporas, and U.S. Community (3 units)
• Ethnic Studies 5800 Theories of social inequality and justice (3 units)

IV. One Research Methodology Course

• Ethnic Studies 5100 Advanced Analysis in Ethnic Studies (3 units)

V. One Capstone Course – Taken last 2 semesters of program

• Ethnic Studies 5010 Advanced Analysis in Ethnic Studies (3 units)

VI. Five Elective Courses within ethnic Studies or other approved classes from affiliated departments or programs. Classes should span three different areas of study. (i.e., Chicana/o, American Indian, Asian-American, African-American—Please see Attachment A)

Purpose of Degree
This degree will prepare students from a wide range of racial and ethnic backgrounds interested in employment with private and public organizations and agencies that work with historically underserved populations. It will help individuals conceptualize socio-historical and political issues from the vantage point of various disciplinary frameworks as well as from the viewpoints of the various peoples that constitute U.S. diverse populations. The degree also serves as a strong foundation for students who plan on pursuing graduate work in areas such as sociology, law, social work, education, psychology, and the health sciences, including medicine.

Institutional Readiness
The University of Utah already has the essential mechanisms (advising, faculty, administrative support) in place to support the implementation of this major. The University of Utah’s Central Administration has been anticipating a major for the ETHNIC Studies Program (ESP). The recommendations from formal external program reviews conducted in 1995 as well as 2008 urged the ESP to initiate a major. This recommendation has formally appeared in the memorandum of understanding signed by the University of Utah Senior Vice President as well as the Ethnic Studies Program during the last program reviews.

The ESP has strong relationships with the various advising units on campus. The Center for Ethnic Student Advising (CESA) has been a partner of the ESP since CESA’s inception. Since CESA advises the majority of students who might be interested in this major, they are already familiar with the program’s course offerings. The Student Advising office is equally familiar
with the ESTP. They have been advising students on the various ESP minors for more than 10 years. The director of the ESP would need to meet with Student Advising staff to discuss the addition of the major.

The ESP faculty is also ready for the commitment of offering a major. The findings from a self study conducted in 2007-2008—center to a Program Review—identified the establishment of an Ethnic Studies major as a top priority. The faculty concluded that for the program to help meet this important priority for the University and its academic mission, it must offer a major.

**Faculty**
The Ethnic Studies faculty is comprised of 14 tenure line faculty members constituting a total 7.66 FTE, as well as two adjunct faculty members that constitute .5 FTE over the course of an academic year. The program also has one non-tenure line affiliated faculty. The distribution of the faculty and staff follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Line Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Tenure Line Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Instructors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ethnic Studies Program has a strong and dedicated core of faculty that will carry out the teaching responsibilities of the Ethnic Studies major. The faculty, are prepared to and excited about, carrying out the proposed major. The faculty has been teaching the core curriculum over the last two years on a regular basis.

The Ethnic Studies Program will need to hire three new tenure line faculty within the next five years. The program review undertaking in the 2007-2008 academic year confirmed this conclusion. In 2011-2012, a search for a scholar with a background in sociology will be needed. Another faculty search will be executed during the 2012-2013 academic year. The area of specialty will need to be in history. Finally, a third hire in 2014-2015 will be needed, whose area of specialization should be in either social work with an emphasis on American-Indian populations. These last two hires would replace two retiring faculty members. All of these tenure line hires will have joint appointment with another department.

The Ethnic Studies Program faculty is currently teaching 95% of the courses identified in element I through IV on a regular basis. Three new .5 FTE’s were added to the faculty in July 2008 who will help in teaching other courses that need to be developed to round out the major offerings. The Ethnic Studies Program needs to identify the need for additional faculty required in each of the first five years of the program.
Staff
An undergraduate advisor will need to be hired in 2011-2012. This person will coordinate advising with the Center for Ethnic Student Advising as well as University Advising.

Library and Information Resources
The resources at Marriott Library are satisfactory for meeting the needs of the program as it carries out the major.

Admission Requirements
Admission requirements will not depart from regular University undergraduate admission requirements.

Student Advisement
The advising will be conducted by a new in-house advisor, along with the director and one other faculty member. The advisor will coordinate services with other advising units that advise students (i.e. University advising and Center of Ethnic Student Advising).

Justification for Graduation Standards and Number of Credits
The number of credits that the major is requiring is consonant with other similar majors from other University of Utah interdisciplinary programs. For example, Gender Studies requires 36 credit hours and the Latin American Studies Program is composed of 33 credit Units. Outside of the rationale of programmatic consonance with like majors, the 33 credit unit allows the Ethnic Studies Program to distribute the various requirement elements across various areas of study.

External Review and Accreditation
Six reviewers--three out of state and three within--from similar research intensive universities consulted on the development of this major. Their input came about as a result of a regularly scheduled Undergraduate Program Review initiated by the University of Utah Undergraduate Studies Office (UGS). The parameters of their input ranged from the design of an Ethnic Studies major to enhancing the Student Credit Hour generation of the program.

Projected Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student Headcount</th>
<th># of Faculty</th>
<th>Student to Faculty Ratio</th>
<th>Accreditation Req’d Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expansion of Existing Program
NA
Section III: Need

Program Need
The Salt Lake Tribune reported in May of 2008 that Utah’s population is becoming more ethnically and racially diverse than ever before. The demographic shift is also reflected at the University of Utah. The proportion of students of color has doubled in the last eight years, currently standing at 12% of the total student body. Two elements are propelling an Ethnic Studies major that will help the University of Utah be responsive to the demographic changes locally as well as nationally. First, individuals from these ethnically diverse populations are enrolling at the University of Utah seeking a major that will enable them to understand the socio-historical dimensions of ethnically and racially diverse people within the United States. The number of students who are assembling a version of this major through the University of Utah's Bachelors of Undergraduate Studies Office has consistently increased over the last 4 years. Second, employers are seeking employees who are culturally competent in their interactions with the diverse populations that now make up Utah and the country. This translates into understanding the social, historical and cultural backgrounds of these various populations. The business and health services community is looking to the University of Utah, the flagship institution within the state, to provide them with a workforce with the skills and competencies to work with diverse populations. The ESP will fulfill both of these needs.

Labor Market Demand
The demographics of the state are experiencing a steady diversifying process in the population of Utah. The University of Utah's Bureau of Economic and Business Research reported in 2008 that all of the twenty nine counties experienced significant growth in the population of ethnic minorities. Furthermore, nine of these are reporting at least 15% minority representation in their total population counts. The five counties (Salt Lake, Summit, Tooele, Utah, Weber) constituting the Wasatch Front hovered between fourteen and twenty-three percent ethnic minority. These five counties constitute the University of Utah's major student feeder areas. The pattern holds nationally in many regions, according to the Brookings' State of Metropolitan America Policy Report (2010). Minority populations are growing at a rapid rate. These populations will need to be served by a workforce that recognizes the distinctive cultural and historical backdrops of these various populations. Employers are seeking a workforce that not only has the linguistic competency to engage these various ethnic groups, but also the cultural knowledge of these populations to engage them respectfully and comprehensively. As an example, the largest sectors projected to grow in the Utah context, between 2010 and 2050, are expected in the health and education sectors--totaling a third of the total job growth (Perlich, 2006). These are two employment domains where cultural competency is vital, which the Ethnic Studies major will provide.

The employment pattern for past graduates of the Undergraduate Studies/Ethnic Studies Social Justice major has included individuals entering education and health related fields. Five have become elementary or secondary teachers while two have started either Masters or Ph.D. programs with the goal of joining the professoriate. Four have begun graduate programs in the medical field.
Student Demand
The Bachelor of Undergraduate Studies Program has been working with the Ethnic Studies Program to help students create an Ethnic Studies major, many times classified as a Social Justice Major. Between the years of 2005 and 2009 there was a steady stream of approximately fifteen to twenty students continuously working towards this degree. Now that the ESP has stepped up its advertisement of this option, the Bachelor of Undergraduate Studies has added six more students who are working toward this major in the period spanning 2008-2010. The program anticipates that the students being drawn to the Ethnic Studies major will include both students of color as well as White students, considering that the latter comprise over 75% of the students who currently enroll in the program's courses.

Similar Programs
No higher education institution in the state of Utah offers a major in Ethnic Studies, but every research intensive institution in the intermountain west and in the PAC-10 offers such a major.

Collaboration with and Impact on Other USHE Institutions
No other institutions within Utah offer this degree.

Benefits
The key benefit of this major to the state of Utah is that it prepares its workforce for a diverse population. The University of Utah's Bureau of Economic and Business Research indicates that the diversification of the state's populations requires a workforce that is adept at understanding the needs and perspectives of a changing demographic landscape. This major will provide individuals who will be employed in Utah with this knowledge. To further facilitate student’s skills, the major will be structured to facilitate a double major option for students to further enhance their skills.

The USHE will also benefit from the addition of this program in that no other institution in the USHE system offers a major in this area. Furthermore, the establishment of this major would help keep the USHE competitive with other similar institutions in the West by matching what other comparable research intensive institutions, such as the University of California system as well as the University of Colorado already offer.

Consistency with Institutional Mission
The University of Utah has as one of its central objectives is to provide students with an opportunity for interdisciplinary studies. The Ethnic Studies Major embraces and actualizes this objective by providing students with a rich interdisciplinary program of study that weaves together conversations about ethnicity, race and diversity through disciplines such as English, History, Political Science, Education and Sociology.

The University of Utah also embraces helping students understand international relationships. The proposed major will help students understand processes and experiences of demographic and social internationalization, or migration, and settlement on the shores of the U.S.

Section IV: Program and Student Assessment

Program Assessment
The goals of the Ethnic Studies Programs are to:
1. Provide students with an interdisciplinary understanding of the histories, experiences, and knowledge of diverse U.S. populations, as well as help them develop an understanding of the socio-historical formation and functioning of race (as a construct) within the U.S. context.
2. Develop students' analytical skills. The Program seeks to help students read academic and social texts critically as well as develop their communication (written and oral) skills to present their ideas in various settings.
3. Provide students with a framework for identifying social, economic and institutional resources within Utah's diverse ethnic communities.

Assessment Mechanisms
1. Written and oral examinations within Ethnic Study courses.
2. Oral presentations within classes.
3. Course projects and papers will also comprise a strong element for determining students’ analysis skills and ability to articulate their positions.

Expected Standards of Performance
The expected standards of performance will encompass both content level and skill level standards.
1. Students will have developed an understanding of the socio-historical relations shaping the political, economic and/or social trajectory of at least two U.S. based ethnic groups.
2. Students will be able to explain at least two of the social and historical forces shaping the formation of race and racial categories in the U.S.
3. Students will be able to define and explain key concepts that underpin the program's content (e.g., intersectionality, racial formation, cultural knowledge, social justice, essentialist and cultural).
4. Students will be able to define the ways in which race, gender, and social class intersect in producing different world views and knowledge frameworks of at least two U.S. based ethnic groups.
5. Students will be able to employ and differentiate between theories to explain patterns and events of social protest and domination that comprise the landscape of U.S. history.
6. Students will develop college level proficiency in their writing skills, specifically identifying and employing the conventions of writing academic texts in both the humanities as well as the social sciences.
7. Students will be able to present an organized presentation of key concepts found in their Ethnic Studies courses.
8. Students will be able to identify the ways in which to frame questions of studying race and ethnicity that correspond to at least two disciplines.

A summative evaluation will be built into the capstone course. Specifically, the course will include a summative course paper that prompts students to trace one of the key threads that they have engaged in during their coursework.

These standards represent standards that the Ethnic Studies faculty believes are crucial to students’ academic and professional development.
# Section V: Finance

## Financial Analysis Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Tuition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition to Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 5 year Budget Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>519378</td>
<td>529765</td>
<td>540360</td>
<td>551168</td>
<td>562191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>519378</td>
<td>529765</td>
<td>540360</td>
<td>551168</td>
<td>562191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Expense</td>
<td>21615</td>
<td>21615</td>
<td>21615</td>
<td>21615</td>
<td>21615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>$540993</td>
<td>$551380</td>
<td>$561975</td>
<td>$572783</td>
<td>$583806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>540993</td>
<td>551380</td>
<td>561975</td>
<td>572783</td>
<td>583806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition to Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$540993</td>
<td>$551380</td>
<td>$561975</td>
<td>$572783</td>
<td>$583806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue-Expense</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Budget Comments**
A clarification of the 5 year Expense line is needed. The expenses across the five year projections reflect costs beyond supporting students enrolled in the major. The expenses support a faculty instructing students enrolled in the major (i.e., 5 in the first year, 10 in the second year), offering an expansive minor degree program within Ethnic Studies that constitutes five minor areas, as well as serving the larger campus with courses that meet the University of Utah’s Diversity requirement.

**Funding Sources**
Funding will the program will be done through traditional routes of legislative funding.

**Reallocation**
N/A

**Impact on Existing Budgets**
No other programs will be affected by the organization of faculty or corresponding budgets.

---

**Appendix A: Program Curriculum**

**All Program Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track/Options (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Course to be added in the Next Five Years**
Appendix B: Program Schedule

Appendix C: Faculty

Edward Buendia
Armando Solorzano
Donna Dehyle
Roderic Land
E. Daniel Edwards
Haruko Moriyasu
Karen Johnson
Wilfred Samuels
Ronald Coleman
William Smith
Dolores Delgado-Bernal
Dolores Calderon
Lourdes Alberto
Baodong Liu
Edmund Fong
Executive Summary
University of Utah
Ethnic Studies Major, B.A./B.S.
2/16/2011

Program Description
The Ethnic Studies Program provides students with an interdisciplinary experience that explores the histories, politics, knowledge frameworks, and cultures of racialized and indigenous populations in the U.S. Courses focus on critical examinations of the entangled social categories of race, ethnicity, indigeneity, culture, gender, sexuality, class, and nation. The Ethnic Studies program permits students to explore processes of contributing to oppression, resistance, migration, and cultural expression/production within individual populations (e.g., African-Americans, Chicanos/as, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders) as well as comparatively.

Role and Mission Fit
This proposed Ethnic Studies major is congruent with the State of Utah’s Board of Regents mission of providing Utah students with the needed knowledge to be productive citizens in a diverse society. The major provides students with the knowledge of the various ethnic groups that constitute Utah and the United States. Furthermore, the proposed major is in harmony with the mission of the University of Utah. The University defines as one of its central objectives that of providing students with an opportunity for interdisciplinary studies. The Ethnic Studies Major embraces and actualizes this objective by providing students with a rich interdisciplinary program of study that weaves together conversations about ethnicity, race and diversity through disciplines such as English, History, Political Science, Education and Sociology. The University of Utah also embraces helping students understand international relationships. The proposed major will help students understand processes and experiences of demographic and social internationalization, or migration, and settlement on the shores of the U.S.

Faculty (Using the format below, indicate the number of discipline specific faculty and level of preparation of the faculty who will support the program. Tenure includes already tenured and tenure-track)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of faculty with Doctoral degrees</th>
<th>Tenure #</th>
<th>Contract #</th>
<th>Adjunct #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Master’s degrees</td>
<td>Tenure #</td>
<td>Contract #</td>
<td>Adjunct #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Bachelor’s degrees</td>
<td>Tenure #</td>
<td>Contract #</td>
<td>Adjunct #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure #</td>
<td>Contract #</td>
<td>Adjunct #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Market Demand (One paragraph giving current data on market demand or the utility of the degree, how the program will accommodate a changing market, and hiring patterns including local, state, and national trends (long-term market needs and numbers to be included).)

45
The demographics of the state are experiencing a steady diversifying process in the population of Utah. The University of Utah's Bureau of Economic and Business Research reported in 2008 that all of the twenty nine counties experienced significant growth in the population of ethnic minorities. Furthermore, nine of these are reporting at least 15% minority representation in their total population counts. The five counties (Salt Lake, Summit, Tooele, Utah, Weber) constituting the Wasatch Front hovered between fourteen and twenty-three percent ethnic minority. These five counties constitute the University of Utah's major student feeder areas. The pattern holds nationally in many regions, according to the Brookings' State of Metropolitan America Policy Report (2010). Minority populations are growing at a rapid rate.

These populations will need to be served by a workforce that recognizes the distinctive cultural and historical backdrops of these various populations. Employers are seeking a workforce that not only has the linguistic competency to engage these various ethnic groups, but also the cultural knowledge of these populations to engage them respectfully and comprehensively. As an example, the largest sectors projected to grow in the Utah context, between 2010 and 2050, are expected in the health and education sectors--totaling a third of the total job growth (Perlich, 2006). These are two employment domains where cultural competency is vital, which the Ethnic Studies major will provide.

**Student Demand**
The Bachelor of Undergraduate Studies Program has been working with the Ethnic Studies Program to help students create an Ethnic Studies major, many times classified as a Social Justice Major. Between the years of 2005 and 2009 there was a steady stream of approximately fifteen to twenty students continuously working towards this degree. Now that the Ethnic Studies Program has increased its advertisement of this option, the Bachelor of Undergraduate Studies has added six more students who are working toward this major in the period spanning 2008-2010. The program anticipates, as defined by a survey of students taking the Introduction to Ethnic Studies course (ETHN 2500), that the students being drawn to the Ethnic Studies major will include both students of color as well as White students, considering that the latter comprise over 75% of the students who currently enroll in the program’s courses.

**Statement of Financial Support** (Indicate from which of the following the funding will be generated: (Provide the detail for funding as part of the “Financial Analysis” section included in the full proposal).)

Legislative Appropriation..........................$540,993
Grants.........................................................0
Reallocated Funds..................................0
Tuition dedicated to the program.................0
Other.............................................................

**Similar Programs Already Offered in the USHE** (A list of similar programs already approved and functioning at USHE institutions.)
No similar programs exist in the Utah Higher Education System.
December 13, 2010

Re: Letter of support for ethnic studies major

It's a pleasure to write a letter in support of the College of Social and Behavioral Science housing the ethnic studies major. It's a natural fit for the college, with many of our faculty having joint appointments in ethnic studies. The major fills a much needed gap in existing curricular offerings, along with addressing issues of considerable prominence on the national stage. Let me offer my strong and enthusiastic support.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

M. David Rudd
Dean
September 2, 2010

Ed Barbanell
Undergraduate Studies
University of Utah

Dear Dr. Barbanell:

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

As the curriculum will comprise largely of existing courses, current collections should be sufficient. A collection of this size and depth satisfies most undergraduate needs. Marriott has an approval plan which automatically provides suitable scholarly books in this area from most major American publishers.

We encourage faculty to work with subject librarians to build up specific sub-disciplines where our collection needs supplementing. Despite budget constraints, we are usually able to order any books necessary to directly support classes. We modify our journal subscriptions to reflect current teaching and research. Endowment funds recently bought the primary literature sets African American Newspapers, Black Drama, and Latino Literature. As the scholarly communication landscape evolves, new options may exist beyond traditional print book purchases and conventional subscriptions. We would like to work with faculty to evaluate the most workable.

Thanks to the state-wide funding received by the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC) and to campus Student Computing Task Force funds, our electronic collection is strong in indexes and full-text online databases such as JSTOR and EthnicNewsWatch.

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

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

Yours truly,

Rick Anderson
Associate Director
Scholarly Resources and Collections

Juli Hinz
Associate Director
Research and Learning Services
April 19, 2010

Professor Kathryn Stockton
Director, Gender Studies Program
290 S. 1500 E. Rm 218
University of Utah

To whom it may concern:

On behalf of the Gender Studies Program, we are writing to support Ethnic Studies’ proposal to institute an Ethnic Studies major at the University of Utah. In light of demographic research indicating that Utah’s workforce and overall population is undergoing a dramatic shift toward greater ethnic and racial diversity, it seems that instituting this major could not be more timely: a major designed to include these issues as a central part of its curriculum would enrich the University as well as Utah’s broader communities. Within the University, an Ethnic Studies major would contribute to the University’s mission of providing all its students with a rigorous educational experience that includes “familiarity with a changing world”; in the broader Utah community, such a major would facilitate “the application of research findings to...well-being of Utah’s citizens” by help to create a workforce attuned to the perspectives and historical contexts of these various ethnic/racial groups.

Given Gender Studies’ own focus on the complex interaction among facets of identity and culture—gender, sexuality, race, class, sexual orientation, sexual subjectivity, disability, and nationality among others—we feel uniquely well positioned to speak to the necessity of an Ethnic Studies major that shares our interest in providing historical and theoretical contexts attuned to historically-underrepresented groups. Indeed, during this past academic year, we have embarked on a series of discussions with Ethnic Studies to explore our shared interests and goals and examine the possibilities for a closer intellectual and teaching collaboration between our programs, based on the overlap between gender and sexuality and ethnic/racial research. These meetings have given us the opportunity to get to know our colleagues in Ethnic Studies in more depth and to see first-hand their desire to maintain and enhance academic rigor, alongside their strong commitment to prepare their students for work and life in a complex and changing world.
In light of these interactions with Ethnic Studies, as well as what we see in the Gender Studies Program, we share their awareness that the increasing racial/ethnic diversity among the broader Utah population is of course reflected in our student community. These students—many of whom also take our classes or become Gender Studies majors or minors—are seeking programs that help them frame their social experiences. The multidisciplinary nature of the proposed Ethnic Studies major curriculum would provide students with an intellectual framework for contextualizing these experiences through both critical race theories and a deep historical knowledge of the struggles, challenges, opportunities, and triumphs that have contributed to the coming into being of today’s richly diverse US society. While enrolled as students, Ethnic Studies majors would undoubtedly start expanding the bridges that already exist between the University and the many communities that comprise our state. After graduation, these students would constitute members of a workforce well equipped to attend to the diverse communities of Utah and the nation.

Please let us know if, in any way, we can further assist your assessment of this exciting prospect for a new major.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Stockton
Director, Gender Studies
November 29, 2010

Dr. Edward Buendia, Director
Ethnic Studies Program
University of Utah Campus

Dear Professor Buendia,

As dean of the College of Education, I am pleased to indicate my full support of the proposed Ethnic Studies undergraduate major which engages faculty from several academic disciplines. This new major will meet a critical need at the University of Utah—that is an interdisciplinary emphasis that examines the experiences and culture of ethnic and racial groups throughout the U.S across the fields of Education, English, History, Psychology and Social Work.

The proposed major will be very attractive to our undergraduate students in both elementary and special education, as well as other colleges and programs engaged in a diversity emphasis. Additionally, the proposed major will also draw from courses that are interdisciplinary and multi-departmental. As such, students have access to course offerings from departments in which they have relatively less exposure to during their undergraduate years.

Once again, I offer my full support of this proposal. Please advise if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Hardman, Dean
October 13, 2010

Dr. John Francis, Sr. Associate Vice President
Academic Affairs

Dear John:

I am very pleased to support the Ethnic Studies Program (ESP) proposal to offer an undergraduate major. Both the 1997 and 2008 ESP program reviews recommended the creation of an undergraduate major, and Academic Affairs concurred with these recommendations. I am confident that Ethnic Studies is now in a position to implement and sustain a high quality major, and join its sister program, Gender Studies, which has offered a minor and major for approximately 10 years.

As an undergraduate academic unit, ESP has offered a minor degree to approximately 500 students during the last three decades. It offers concentrations in Chicano/o Studies, African American Studies, American Indian Studies, and Asian/Pacific Studies, supported by eighteen current tenure-track/tenured faculty who also hold a joint appointment in eight academic departments. ESP has maintained a long-standing commitment to interdisciplinarity in the undergraduate curriculum.

Need
Almost three quarters of the students who take Ethnic Studies courses are white undergraduates. This noteworthy statistic shows that ESP not only serves underrepresented students of color, but also fulfills its educational mission of exposing majority white students to the histories, current status, cultural norms and values of racial and ethnic populations that have been so integral to the development of the U.S. and the Western Hemisphere. Given the growing diversity of the State of Utah and the U.S., it is more imperative today than ever before that all of our students graduate with a deeper understanding of the cultural and racial complexities that now exist in our society and across the world.

Quality of Program
ESP faculty are leading scholars in their home discipline and in the interdisciplinary field of Ethnic Studies. Their research and teaching has been widely acknowledged as superior by our University and their scholarly fields. The faculty include five recipients of a prestigious National Academies/Ford Foundation Fellowship, as well as other laudable recognitions in their discipline. Given the small number of faculty of color on the campus, Ethnic Studies faculty also serve as mentors, role models, and outstanding teachers to students of color.

Resources
If the major is approved for Ethnic Studies, my Office would enhance its commitment to the Program during its first three years by helping it secure three new, tenure-track, jointly appointed faculty positions.

In summary, I enthusiastically join Ethnic Studies faculty and others in supporting the creation of a major in the Ethnic Studies program.

Sincerely,

Octavio Villalpando
Associate Vice President

Diversity = Educational Excellence!
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Overview

Attached for your approval is a proposal for adding a new policy and revising an existing policy on part-time status for regular faculty and academic librarians.

Adopting this proposal will enable departments to provide a range of three alternative part-time arrangements for individual faculty needing to balance work and family needs, and will ensure that such arrangements are implemented only when doing so also serves the interests of the department and University. It is expected to improve the University’s ability to recruit and maintain diverse, high quality faculty.

First, the proposal will make more transparent and clarify procedures for the existing policy that enables faculty to take a partial leave of absence at partial pay or to reduce permanently to a part-time position. These two existing options, currently codified in an obscure section of Policy 6-314 (http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-314.html), will be brought into the new Policy 6-320 to be joined with another, new alternative. The new option will allow faculty to temporarily reduce from full-time to part time—for a period of up to two years (and possibly renewable), with concomitant part-time compensation and benefits. This new option differs from partial leave of absence at partial pay because the latter allows retention of full employee benefits (including sick and vacation leave and reduced tuition benefits) below the FTE at which they would normally apply, but only for up to one year. The new option allows for a longer time in part-time status than a partial leave at partial pay, but with reduced benefits and frequent reviews to ensure that the arrangement is working well for both the individual and department.

For faculty not yet tenured, only the shorter term alternatives will ordinarily be permissible, and the new Policy lays out detailed steps and standards for adapting departmental RPT requirements to apply to a faculty member who takes part-time status for some portion of the pre-tenure probationary period. Originally, this proposal included an option for a tenure-track faculty member to be hired permanently on a part-time basis. As a result of feedback received during extensive cross-campus consultation, the proposal now presented eliminates that option, except possibly in special circumstances, such as compliance with the ADA for a faculty member with a disability or two people sharing one position (i.e., “job sharing.”). Eliminating the option for permanent part-time status before tenure resulted in major reorganization of the attached final draft of the Policy.
Having this set of three distinct alternatives will allow tailoring of individual arrangements to best meet faculty members’ and institutional needs. Of the three, it is expected that the two of short duration will be the most frequently used.

Having the three alternatives framed in a single Policy, easily accessible, with detailed descriptions of prerequisites and procedures, will make the available options transparent for existing faculty and administrators, and for recruitment candidates.

Each of the alternatives will be permissible only upon mutual agreement of the individual faculty member and the appointing department, and with the approval of the dean and cognizant vice president. The proposed approval processes are designed to ensure that the part-time alternatives are used for appropriate purposes only (primarily family responsibilities), and to protect against faculty members being pressured into accepting part-time work for inappropriate reasons. Each request for a part-time alternative must be initiated by the faculty member—and must be consistent with the stated purposes of the Policy—and not motivated primarily by institutional budgetary concerns. And only those departments which affirmatively choose to participate in the offering of part-time alternatives will do so--- as each request from a faculty member seeking a part-time alternative must first be approved by the department. The new Policy is crafted quite carefully, to ensure that part-time arrangements are implemented only in specific instances in which all levels concur in the judgment that such an arrangement will serve well the institutional interests of the department and broader University, as well as meeting the needs of the faculty member making the request.

Along with the quite detailed provisions of the Policy itself, if the proposal is approved, we anticipate that the vice-presidential offices would be developing and providing examples, forms and other guidance materials to assist faculty and administrators to determine when a particular alternative is appropriate, and to move efficiently through the request and approval processes. A sample listing of those guidance materials is attached.

The proposal reflects a commitment made at the time of adoption of the policies on faculty parental leaves in 2006, which was that the University would explore developing policies responding to a broader array of family needs of faculty. The proposal as it has now taken specific form has been under active development since 2008-2009 and has benefitted from substantial research into practices at peer institutions as well as from broad intensive consultation within the University. It has been developed primarily by a special subcommittee of the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women. It has been discussed either in concept or in full form with the full membership of the Presidential Commission, the University RPT Standards Committee, the faculty Annuities and Salaries Committee, representatives of the Human Resources division, the Office of Equal Opportunity, the Council of Academic Deans, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Institutional Policy Committee. The various concerns raised in those many settings have been carefully attended to in crafting this final version of the proposal.

If you approve of the proposal, it will next be presented to the Senate Executive Committee and then to the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees.

The proposal documents provided include
i) this memorandum,

ii) a “Summary and Highlights” description provided by the PCSW subcommittee,
iii) a sample listing of the set of guidance documents that could be developed and provided to assist faculty and departments using the new Policy (including a set of examples of the workings of the part-time alternatives), and

iv) the proposed contents of new Policy 6-320 and revisions for existing Policies 6-300 and 6-314.

Background
Origins and Development of the Proposal

The motivation to develop the proposal came from several directions, some from within the University, and some from the national faculty recruitment market. Nationally, a 2005 report by the American Council on Education entitled “An Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Tenure-Track Faculty Careers” recommended a part-time tenure option as one of a set of family-friendly policies. Other flexibility policies include: family leaves, tenure-clock extensions, and dual-career hiring options, some of which the University has already adopted. Family-friendly policies help recruit and retain faculty members, especially women, in dual-career or single-parent families. Biologically important years for child-bearing and rearing typically coincide with the pre-tenure probationary period. National research demonstrates that family formation has a much greater impact on women’s careers compared with men’s careers (Mason and Goulden 2002). Research also shows that younger faculty members in general value work-life balance more than their older colleagues (Gallagher and Trower 2009; Trower 2009). At other career stages some faculty members may face extended periods of caring for elderly parents or wish to balance their academic service with other professionally related activities, such as professional practice or government service.

To accommodate these ends, many prominent research universities have adopted policies providing for part-time service by tenure-track faculty, including the Universities of Washington, Pittsburgh, Iowa, Iowa State, New Mexico, Virginia Tech, Ohio State, Michigan, North Carolina-Chapel Hill (post-tenure only), Wisconsin, Utah State, and the University of California system. While the policy proposed is geared primarily to those who want to balance work for the University with family commitments, it would also permit an already tenured faculty member and the department to agree on a part-time arrangement for other reasons.

In addition to reflecting this national trend, interest in a policy supporting part-time appointments arose within the University, both in the context of the adoption of the University’s existing faculty parental leaves policy, and then more recently.

The University’s policies on faculty parental leaves were enacted in spring 2006 and 2007. Obtaining the approval of the Academic Senate for those policies was among the most challenging policy-development projects in the University’s recent history. A substantial number of Senate members were concerned that the parental leaves policies (which essentially only address needs of faculty parents with newborn/ newly adopted children) were too narrow—and they urged as an alternative that the University adopt broader policies which would recognize the needs faculty might have to care for older children with special needs, elderly parents, etc., as well as newborns. In the end, the Senate approved the narrower parental leave policies (now in Policies 6-315 and 8-002), with a commitment from the Senate leadership and central administration that the University would over time explore possible development of broader policies—and the current proposal is in keeping with that commitment.

More recently, interest within the University for developing the specific proposal now being presented was raised from two local sources. In 2007 one college received an inquiry from
two talented women candidates who wished to ‘job share’ (i.e., each at part-time) in order to balance work and family. The college prepared an offer to the candidates, though they ultimately chose another institution. Their inquiry highlighted the lack of a clear policy for part-time options for regular faculty at the University of Utah.

Second, the Faculty Climate Survey conducted by the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW) in spring 2008 found numerous faculty members struggling with work-family integration. Of 512 full-time, tenure-track faculty respondents, 101 were less than fully satisfied with their childcare arrangements. Family challenges do not end when children pass childcare age. Nineteen faculty members spent over 20 hours per week in the previous three years providing “on-going care for an adolescent or adult family member.” Such responsibilities take their toll. One hundred sixty-five respondents (32%) agreed either strongly or somewhat that “Personal responsibilities (e.g., child care, elder care) have slowed down my career progress.” Two hundred six (40%) agreed either strongly or somewhat that they “forgo professional activities (e.g., trainings, sabbaticals, conferences, grand rounds) because of personal responsibilities.” Women were significantly more likely than men to agree with these statements. The survey also asked directly: “I would prefer a part-time tenured/tenure-track position over a full-time position.” 93 of the 512 respondents (18%) agreed either strongly or somewhat, and again the results were statistically significant by gender.

During the 2008-09 academic year the PCSW created a subcommittee chaired by Susan Olson, Associate Vice President for Faculty, to explore the possibility of a formal University policy supporting the option of regular (i.e., tenured and tenure-track) faculty working on a part-time basis. Other subcommittee members are Jennifer Allie, Health Science Faculty Affairs; Carrie Byington, Department of Pediatrics; Robin Heaton, PCSW research assistant; Lauren Liang, Department of Educational Psychology; Patricia Murphy, College of Nursing; Leslie Sieburth, Department of Biology; Liz Tashjian, Department of Finance; and Joanne Yaffe, College of Social Work.

After reviewing and discussing twenty-nine articles and policy papers on the topic and existing policies on part-time tenure at numerous public research universities (references available on request), the subcommittee developed a concept-only proposal for consideration by the University community. In 2009-10 the concept proposal circulated for feedback to the PCSW, the University RPT Standards Committee, department chairs and deans in both Academic Affairs and Health Sciences, the senior vice presidents, and the Academic Senate Executive Committee. Taking into account the feedback from that initial broad consultation, a first draft specific Policy proposal was developed in fall 2010 and has now been circulated to most of the above groups as well Human Resources, the Office of General Counsel, and the faculty Annuities and Salaries Committee. Feedback from that extensive consultation led to significant revising to develop the final proposal now presented for your approval and forwarding.
Summary and Highlights of
Proposed Policy on Part-time Status for Regular Faculty and Academic Librarians

from the
Subcommittee on Part-time Status for Regular Faculty,
Presidential Commission on the Status of Women
[draft March 26, 2011]

1. Balancing Values in the Policy

Based on its extensive research nationally and at the University of Utah, the subcommittee developed the proposal for this Policy in a way that recognizes and balances competing values.

A policy permitting part-time status for faculty will contribute to recruiting and retaining a small number of valuable faculty members who cannot or prefer not to commit to full-time faculty work for the University for all or some portion of their academic career.

The proposed policy recognizes that the value of accommodating individual faculty members’ desire for work-life balance must be weighed against the needs of departments, colleagues, and students. The proposal strikes that balance in two ways. It does not create an entitlement for an individual to have a part-time position, and it requires individual agreements that spell out the details of any such arrangements. An excellent statement of the assumptions and interests at stake appears in a policy of another university, from which the subcommittee borrowed some features for the proposal:

“While tenure-track and tenure appointments are normally full time, Virginia Tech recognizes the importance of allowing flexibility in the percent of employment so that faculty members can better manage the balance between their professional work and family or personal obligations over a defined period of time, or perhaps permanently. The policy is intended to encourage departments to accommodate reasonable requests for part-time appointments, however part-time appointments are not an entitlement, and requests may be turned down when the faculty member and the department cannot agree to a workable plan.” Virginia Tech Faculty Policy 2.6.1.3

Two circumstances required particular attention in developing the Policy: 1) when the part-time status would be temporary and 2) when the part-time service occurs during the pre-tenure probationary period. Being part-time for a temporary period may best meet the needs of faculty members who wish to reduce their professional commitments during an especially demanding period of ill health or of care-giving. On the other hand, departments cannot be expected to hold open indefinitely the remainder of a full-time position. Those who are hired temporarily to fill in for faculty who are moving to part-time are rarely able to fill the full range of departmental roles that a tenure-track faculty member does. The proposed policy would permit temporary part-time appointments only for relatively short, albeit renewable, periods of time,
allowing for renegotiation by all parties, if needed. In this regard the proposed policy is similar to but more specific than long-time University Policy 6-314-Sec. 12.

The other complex consideration is adapting policies for RPT reviews during the probationary period to a part-time faculty appointment. The central idea of the probationary period is to evaluate the quality of a faculty member’s performance in research, teaching, service, and (for some) clinical care before the University makes a commitment to tenure for the individual. Although evaluations of quality are not intrinsically tied to any specified quantity of work, assessments of quality and quantity are not easily separated. Most departments have norms about the appropriate quantity of research and publishing expected for tenure, and some research also has its own intrinsic pace from conceptualization to publication. In assessing a faculty member who has been part-time for some or all of the probationary period, an institution could in principle either decrease the quantity of work expected for tenure or increase the length of the probationary period. The American Association of University Professors prefers the former approach, but virtually all institutions with part-time tenure policies that the subcommittee has identified have opted for the latter approach, perhaps doubting that faculty would adjust their long-held expectations for a tenurable amount of research. The proposed Policy takes the latter approach—articulating the principle that the tenure clock should be lengthened proportionately to the percentage of a full-time appointment the individual holds.

However, in the consultation with various constituencies across the University, a concern surfaced that carrying this principle to its logical conclusion may be impractical. It could lead to probationary periods of as long as 14 years in some cases, and comments were received with the view that such a long period is simply too long. Accordingly, the proposal presented incorporates two alternatives. One alternative would apply the proportional extension principle generally, but with an outside limit set, such as 10 years. *Given the division of views received on this issue, it is best that the Academic Senate make the choice between these alternatives.*

Also related to the meshing of RPT proceedings and part-time status, the subcommittee recommends that pre-tenure faculty spend a portion of the probationary period in full-time status, ordinarily at the beginning of the period, ensuring that they become acquainted with departmental norms, establish effective relationships with colleagues, and develop teaching skills and research programs, before taking temporary part-time status. This is recommended, but not strictly required, because faculty members may be starting their faculty appointments just at the time they most need career flexibility for family reasons. It is preferable to leave some flexibility for departments and the individual faculty members to tailor a plan for individual circumstances.

2. **Highlights of the proposed Policy.** One must of course read the full policy for details. The most noteworthy major features of the proposed policy are:

- **Three alternatives for part-time status.** Three distinct alternatives for part-time status are established. i) The “partial leave of absence at partial pay” alternative is for up to one-year, and should be particularly appropriate for many interested faculty because if the FTE % is at least half-time, the faculty member will remain eligible for some important benefits (sick and vacation leave and reduced tuition) that are not available under the other two alternatives if one goes below .75 FTE. It is not renewable. ii) The “temporary two-year part-time” alternative is for up to two years (and possibly renewable for additional two-year periods). For both of the above, the faculty member has an underlying full-time position and will revert to full-time status upon completion of the part-time arrangement. iii) The
“permanent part-time” alternative is ordinarily available only for faculty already tenured. Once a full-time position is converted to permanent part-time or a faculty member is hired with tenure into a part-time position, the University has no obligation to subsequently increase it to full-time. It is anticipated that the most widely used of the three alternatives will be the one-year-or-less partial leave, and that the permanent alternative will be used rarely (and in some departments perhaps not ever).

- **FMLA benefits as an additional source of assistance for faculty.** Some faculty members considering part-time status might find it appropriate to also or instead exercise the benefits the University provides pursuant to the Family Medical Leave Act—allowing for leave under University Policy 5-200, which is paid to the extent that the faculty member has accrued sick leave. A reference to 5-200 will be included with this part-time Policy, and guidance materials provided by the vice presidents’ offices will include information about the FMLA alternative benefit.

- **Eligible faculty.** The part-time alternatives are available both for existing faculty, and for new faculty, and so are expected to be valuable both in retaining and recruiting high quality faculty.

- **Permissible reasons for part-time.** The primary purpose for the new Policy is to enable departments to better accommodate the needs of faculty members faced with pressing family care responsibilities, or similar personal needs (e.g., health issues), and processing of requests will include consideration of whether a request is consistent with the underlying principles of the Policy. For faculty already tenured, a department may find acceptable a broader array of reasons for a request.

- **Acceptability of terms by all parties.** Use of part-time arrangements must always be by mutual agreement, with multiple levels of approval. Requests must be initiated by the faculty member (not institutionally imposed on a reluctant faculty member), and the terms must first be found by the department to be consistent with the best interests of the department, and then approved by the dean and vice president. During development of the proposal, a concern was expressed from some departments and deans that their units likely would not find it appropriate to participate in offering part-time status, at least not of longer duration than the one-year partial leave. The proposal has been crafted to directly address that concern—any department is permitted, but no department is required---to agree to a part-time arrangement. Related to this, in early discussions with the Academic Senate and other groups, the subcommittee was informed of a concern that a faculty member and department chair might have difficulties working through consideration of a request for part-time status without some early guidance from the office of the vice president. In response, the policy proposal was revised to include early notice to the vice president of a request in case any party seeks guidance from the vice president’s office early on. Having the vice president’s office assisting the faculty member and department should ensure that there is a careful well-balanced decision-making process.
- **Careful documentation.** Each request approved must include detailed documentation of the workload and compensation during the part-time status, and documentation of the manner in which RPT tenure and promotion procedures will be adapted for the part-time status. The Policy imposes certain principles governing such adaptations, and the office of the cognizant vice president will provide guidance on preparation of the required documents, consistent with those principles. (See the list of sample documents to be provided.) Any changes to RPT procedures or standards must be approved by the RPT Chair and often by the full departmental RPT advisory committee, as well as cognizant administrators.

- **Intellectual property rights.** In the subcommittee’s consultations with the Council of Academic Deans, a concern was expressed that the University might stand to lose valuable intellectual property if part-time faculty members argued that their innovations arose from the non-University portion of their time. It was found that this concern is already directly addressed in the University’s existing policies for Patents and Inventions (Policy 7-002, Sec. III.B.1.) and Conflict of Interest (Policy 1-006), which explicitly cover part-time as well as full-time faculty.

### 3. Conclusion

The subcommittee expects that the new Policy providing for part-time faculty is unlikely to be used by very many faculty members because most faculty and their families rely on a full-time salary. The Policy will however, provide an option helpful to the University in attracting and/or retaining a small number of excellent faculty members who are committed to combining their academic careers with commitments to family (or in some cases other professional activities). The long-time University policies and practices providing for partial leaves of absence at partial pay and for conversion to permanent part-time status already recognize this value. The new Policy would expand and also elevate the visibility of the options for part-time status, and provide clear direction for structuring part-time arrangements so that departments and interested individual faculty can negotiate them openly and equitably.
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examples of
Guidance Materials for
Policy 6-320-- Part-time status for regular faculty and academic library
faculty
Which could be developed and provided to interested faculty and administrators by
office of the Sr. Vice President [draft Feb. 19, 2011]

If the proposed Policy is approved, the office of the vice president would develop and
make available a set of guidance materials to assist faculty and administrators in implementing
the new Policy.
These might include

- Illustrative examples of the workings of Policy 6-320

- Sample of “Request Letter” (by which a faculty member may initiate a request for
  part-time status, per 6-320-III-F-2)

- Sample documentation of terms for approved Partial Leave of Absence with Partial
  Pay (per 6-320-III-B).

- Sample of “Workload Memorandum” (documenting workload and compensation of a
  faculty member in part-time status, per 6-320-III-F-2)

- Sample of “RPT Memorandum” (documenting any modifications of otherwise
  applicable criteria, standards and procedures for RPT evaluations of a faculty member in part-
  time status, per 6-320-III- F-1-c & F-2-c)

- Sample of “offer letter” (by which terms of part-time status will be incorporated into
  offer made to candidate for new appointment at the University, per 6-320-III-F-1)
Contents: (i) new Policy 6-320. (ii) revision of Policy 6-300. (iii) revision of Policy 6-314.

[new] University Policy 6-320: Part-time status for regular faculty and academic library faculty. Revision 0. Effective date [?? July 1, 2011]

I. Purpose and Scope.
A. This Policy describes the permissible arrangements for part-time status for regular faculty positions (tenured or tenure-track), including academic library faculty. It is not intended to directly govern any auxiliary faculty positions or any non-faculty employee positions.

B. The University permits faculty positions to be less than full-time in those specific circumstances for which part-time status is both appropriate to accommodate important personal needs of the individual faculty member—such as family care responsibilities or other similarly important personal needs—and serves the institutional needs of the University. Accommodating these personal responsibilities of faculty members is the primary purpose of this Policy, as that serves to advance the University's commitment to diversity in recruiting and retaining the highest quality faculty. Accordingly, this Policy is intended to encourage academic units to accommodate an individual faculty member’s (or candidate’s) reasonable expressed interest in working only part-time for the University when doing so will serve those values.

C. This Policy does not govern faculty members who for a limited time period have reduced responsibilities solely as a result of participating in the University’s phased retirement program (see Policy 5-309). This Policy also does not apply to faculty members whose responsibilities are divided (1) between two or more academic units of the University (as addressed in Policies 6-319 on joint appointment procedures and 6-303 on RPT procedures for appointments split between a department and an academic program) or (2) between faculty responsibilities and a University administrative position (as addressed in Policy 6-311-Sec. 4-C-2-b, & Sec.6) are not considered to be part-time for purposes of this policy. Neither the joint nor the split form of faculty appointment nor the combination of faculty and administrative appointment are considered to be part-time faculty positions for purposes of this Policy if the individual faculty member’s combined responsibilities within the University are the equivalent of full-time. Health Sciences faculty practicing outside of the University (for example at the Veterans Administration or Primary Children’s medical centers), who are considered to have full-time tenure-track or tenured affiliations with the University, are not covered by this Policy. Exceptions which bring a Health Sciences faculty position into the scope of this Policy as a part-time position are subject to department chair, and cognizant dean and vice president review and approval.

II. Definitions. These definitions apply for the limited purposes of this Policy.
A. “Faculty,” or “Regular Faculty” includes only regular faculty (tenured or on the tenure track), and academic library faculty (with continuing appointment status or in the continuing appointment track), not any category of auxiliary faculty. See Policy 6-300
(University Faculty), and 6-306 (Academic Library Faculty) for further description of these categories of faculty. With respect to academic library faculty, any references herein to tenure shall be construed to refer to continuing appointment status.

B. “Full-time faculty” position is a regular faculty position for which the workload is 75 percent or more of the normal possible work load for regular faculty within the pertinent academic unit with similar term appointments (terms of nine-months to twelve-months). This normal workload is referred to here as “full-time equivalent” (“FTE”).

C. “Part-time faculty” status refers to an arrangement for a regular faculty position under which the workload is reduced to 74 percent or less of the normal possible workload of full-time regular faculty with similar term appointments within the pertinent academic unit (with an accompanying reduction in compensation). See Policies 5-001 (generally defining full-time and part-time personnel) and 5-204 (defining full-time faculty for purposes of policy restricting outside employment activities).

D. Three types of part-time faculty arrangements are permitted under this Policy, distinguished by duration of the part-time status, and effect on eligibility for employee benefits. A “one-year partial leave” status is an arrangement under which the faculty member is otherwise permanently full-time, but reduces to a part-time FTE for up to one year in duration (referred to as “taking a partial leave at partial pay”). A “two-year temporary part-time” status is an arrangement under which the faculty member is otherwise permanently full-time, but reduces to a part-time FTE for up to two years (and possibly renewable as described in III-C below). A “permanent part-time” position is one for which the faculty member is expected to remain in a part-time status for the entire remaining career at the University.

III. Policy

A. General principles.

1. Full-time positions shall continue to be the norm for regular faculty at the University (and in each academic unit). Unless otherwise explicitly provided in an individual’s employee record, it is presumed that each regular faculty member of the University holds a full-time faculty appointment, from the date of initial appointment through the date of retirement or separation from the University.

2. (i) For faculty already tenured, part-time status may be established either temporarily (one-year partial leave or two-year temporary part-time), or permanently. (ii) For faculty not yet tenured, permanent part-time positions are ordinarily not permitted—only the one-year partial leave, or two-year temporary part-time arrangements. Exceptions may be permitted to allow permanent part-time status for pre-tenure faculty members (a) in what are commonly referred to as “job-sharing” arrangements in which two persons, each part-time, share what is effectively a single full-time faculty role within a single academic unit, or (b) as a reasonable accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act and University Policy 5-117. In cases involving these exceptions, the principles and procedures of this Policy shall be followed to the extent possible.

3. For any position established as permanently part-time, neither the faculty member nor the academic unit has a unilateral right to subsequently increase the FTE of the position, but they may later restructure the position upon mutually acceptable terms approved by the cognizant dean and vice president. Approval of such increase in FTE will be dependent on a determination that the restructuring serves the institutional needs of the department, college and University.
4. Only under exceptional circumstances shall part-time arrangements be permitted at less than one-half of full-time (.5 FTE), although a part-time position established at .5 FTE or greater may be permitted to be reduced below .5 FTE for brief periods during a leave. Current regulations on eligibility for employee benefits should be consulted for the effect of such reductions.

5. For faculty already tenured, part-time arrangements (permanent or temporary), may be determined to be appropriate for balancing University work with either family care responsibilities or similar personal needs, or with non-University professional or public service activities. For faculty not yet tenured, part-time arrangements (one-year partial leave or two-year temporary part-time) will ordinarily be permitted only for balancing University work with family care responsibilities (or similar personal needs). This limitation on eligibility of pre-tenure faculty is considered necessary to protect the integrity and fairness of the University’s processes for assessing candidates for tenure.

6. A request for part-time status should originate with the faculty member (or candidate) rather than from unit administrators, and structuring of positions as part-time rather than full-time should not be motivated primarily by institutional budgetary considerations. These principles apply both to positions initially established as part-time upon a faculty member’s initial appointment, and to existing faculty members’ moves to permanent, one-year partial leave, or two-year temporary part-time status.

7. In each request for part-time status, the academic unit and University administrators should ensure that the part-time arrangement also adequately serves the institutional needs of the department, college and University. Part-time arrangements are not an entitlement, and requests may be turned down when there are non-discriminatory institutional reasons for declining the faculty member’s proposed plan.

8. To ensure fair and consistent treatment of both full- and part-time faculty within an academic unit, the allocation of responsibilities and resources for each part-time position shall be proportional relative to otherwise equivalent full-time positions within the academic unit, and relative to other part-time positions. Ordinarily, part-time faculty should contribute to all of the same areas of responsibility as do full-time faculty, but with expectations of accomplishment in each area reduced proportionally according to percentage of FTE.

9. This policy shall be implemented consistently with the University’s commitment to nondiscrimination in all employment-related practices and decisions. (See Policy 5-106.)

B. One-year Partial Leave of Absence at Partial Pay

1. *Benefits eligibility with qualifying partial leave.* A faculty member may take a partial leave of absence at partial pay, pursuant to this Policy and Policy 6-314-Sec.-12-A. Eligibility for employee benefits ordinarily available to full-time faculty will be preserved as unaffected by such leave if a) the leave is of one-year or less, and b) the percentage of FTE is no less than .5 during the partial leave.

2. *Effect of partial leave on RPT period.* For a faculty member not yet tenured who takes a partial leave under this Policy which reduces the percentage of FTE to below .75 for nine months, the RPT probationary period will be
increased by one year. The probationary period will ordinarily not be increased by taking a partial leave of less than nine months. A description of any effect on the probationary period shall be included in the combined memorandum required by Part III-B-5 below, and once approved such description shall apply notwithstanding any other University Policy.

3. **Non-renewable.** A partial leave of absence at partial pay that preserves eligibility for full-time employee benefits and/or results in increase of the probationary period shall not be extended beyond one year. However, the faculty member may, through the procedures described below, request that another part-time arrangement under this Policy 6-320 (two-year temporary, or permanent if eligible) be granted, to begin at any time following completion of the partial leave (with a resulting change in employee benefits eligibility upon completion of the partial leave).

4. **Reasons for leave.** For faculty not yet tenured, a request for partial leave of absence at partial pay under this Policy will ordinarily be granted only for reasons of balancing University work with family care responsibilities or similar personal needs.

5. **Approval procedures.**
   a. **Request letter.** A request from an existing full-time faculty member for a partial leave of absence at partial pay under this Policy shall be described in a request letter submitted to the department chairperson (or equivalent). The request letter shall describe the reasons for the leave and specify the desired calendar dates for starting and ending the leave. The request letter shall be copied to the cognizant vice president to provide notice that a request is under consideration, and enable the vice president’s office to provide guidance on further processing of the request.
   b. **Memorandum.** If the chairperson supports the request, s/he shall prepare a memorandum of understanding documenting the planned workload, FTE percentage, and compensation for the faculty member during the partial leave and, if before tenure, any effect the leave will have on the RPT probationary period (specifically timing of RPT reviews). For purposes of setting the workload, the principle that part-time faculty should contribute to all of the same areas of responsibility as do full-time faculty, proportional to their FTE, may be relaxed during a partial leave of absence at partial pay.
   c. **Approval.** The request letter and memorandum shall then be submitted for the approval of the dean and cognizant vice president. If the partial leave with a modification of the RPT period is approved, the department chairperson shall add to the candidate’s RPT file a notice of that RPT modification.

C. **Two-year temporary part-time status.**
   1. At the request of a faculty member a temporary part-time status may be granted for a period of up to two years in duration. Upon further request, renewal of such status may be granted for one or more additional periods of up to two years each, at the same or a changed percentage of FTE. The length of the period (including calendar dates of beginning and end) shall be specified in a written
agreement at the time of initial granting and for each subsequent renewal. Ordinarily, negotiations for any renewal should be completed at least 6-months prior to the renewal date.

2. If a temporary part-time status is not renewed, the faculty member must resume his/her full-time status as of the previously agreed end-date of the temporary status.

3. For faculty not yet tenured, requests for such temporary part-time status will ordinarily be granted only for reasons of balancing University work with family care responsibilities or similar personal needs. For faculty already tenured, requests for such status may be granted for reasons of balancing University work with either family care responsibilities or similar personal needs, or with non-University professional or public service activities compatible with the institutional interests of the department, college, and University.

4. The effect of temporary part-time status on the probationary period is discussed in Section E. below. Procedures for approval of part-time status are discussed in Section F. below.

D. Permanent part-time positions.

1. Permanent part-time positions are normally permitted only for a faculty member who has already received tenure. A faculty member may be initially appointed, with tenure, to a permanent part-time position, or an existing tenured faculty member in a full-time position may request to reduce the position permanently to part-time.

2. Requests from tenured faculty for permanent part-time positions may be granted for reasons of balancing University work with either family care responsibilities or similar personal needs, or with non-University professional or public service activities compatible with the institutional interests of the department, college, and University.

3. In the case of conversion of an existing full-time position to a permanent part-time position, the faculty member’s signed request must include an explicit statement permanently releasing the University from any future obligation to provide the faculty member with more than a stipulated fraction of regular full-time compensation and employee benefits.  {Drafting note: this language, with minor variation is taken from existing Policy 6-314 Sec. 12-B (Change to Permanent Part-time Appointment), from which similar language is being deleted so that 6-320 alone will now govern this topic.}

4. The recruitment and initial appointment of a faculty member to a part-time position shall be conducted in accord with Policy 6-302 (appointments) and Policy 6-303–III-K (new appointments with tenure), and shall follow all other ordinary processes for faculty appointments with the following exception: a faculty member initially appointed to a part-time position under this Policy 6-320 must have the same background checks as full-time regular faculty members (see Policy 5-130 and Rule 5-130A), notwithstanding any exemption of part-time faculty stated in those or any other University Regulation.

5. The effect of permanent part-time status on post-tenure reviews and
promotion is discussed in Part III-E-3, below. Procedures for approval of permanent part-time status are discussed in Part III-F, below.

E. Modifications of retention, promotion, tenure ("RPT"), and post-tenure reviews for part-time faculty (schedules and standards).

1. Part- and full-time faculty members should be assessed on the same quality and generally similar overall quantities of accomplishment. Ordinarily the RPT modification for a part-time position is to increase the review period while requiring a similar total quantity of work at the point of formal review. The annual rate of scholarly productivity expected for each stage within a faculty career should reflect a position’s percentage of full-time effort.

2. Modified RPT terms during the pre-tenure probationary period
   a. For faculty members who are in a part-time status with the percentage of FTE reduced below .75 for nine months or longer during their probationary period, the applicable probationary period [shall] be increased proportionally to the percentage of FTE and duration of the part-time status.
   b. A proportional increase of the probationary period is calculated by dividing the maximum normal length (for assistant professors 7 years unless 6 years by department or college policy) by the percentage of full-time appointment. If the FTE of the appointment changes during the probationary period, the years of full-time service toward the maximum probationary period are calculated as the summed duration of the part-time appointment in years, multiplied by the fraction of the appointment. Though less than six full months, each full semester of half-time service shall count as .5 years for faculty on less than 12-month appointments. After summation of the part-time appointment, a remaining partial year less than or equal to 0.5 years of service will not increase the probationary period an additional year, whereas a partial year greater than .5 years will be rounded up to increase the period by 1.0 additional year.
   {Drafting note: Guidance materials provided by the VP’s office will include examples illustrating such calculations based on various common scenarios.}

{Alternative #1}

{Drafting note: Two alternatives are shown here, to facilitate discussion and eventual decision making on a matter that has had significant attention in consultations for drafting of the proposal.
The first alternative: Add no additional language at this point. The result of this would be to allow a faculty member for whom all parties had approved half-time status for a succession of two-year periods to have as much as a 14-year probationary period in a unit with a 7-year period for full-time faculty, 12 years in a unit with a 6-year probationary period, or 10 years if the normal period is 5 years (initially appointed as associate professor or professor).}

{Alternative #2}

c. Notwithstanding the amount of time spent in part-time status, the maximum applicable probationary period shall be ____ years for a faculty member in a unit with a normally 7-year probationary period for full-time faculty, ____ years in a unit with a normally 6-year probationary period, or ____ years for a faculty member initially appointed at the rank of associate professor
or professor (for whom the normal probationary period of a full-time faculty member is 5 years).

[c. or d.] The provisions of Policy 6-311-Sec.4-C apply for part-time faculty, to shorten or extend the otherwise applicable probationary period (as calculated under the above formula), with the following modification. A faculty member who has served in the academic unit for a number of years equal to the normal probationary period for full-time faculty in that unit (albeit at part-time status for some of those years), and wishes to shorten the otherwise applicable period based on “extraordinary progress” (6-311-Sec. 4-C-1-b), must obtain (and need only obtain) the approvals of the department’s chairperson and RPT committee chairperson.

[d. or e.] The RPT review schedules for faculty in part-time status shall ordinarily include annual reviews, with informal reviews to occur in any year a formal review is not scheduled. The first formal retention review shall ordinarily occur in the same year as for full-time faculty in the same academic unit. Formal reviews should be coordinated with renewals of part-time status, where possible, and should occur no less often than every four years of part-time status. The exact schedule of formal reviews must be articulated clearly in the RPT memorandum described in Part III-F-1-c or F-2-c below.

3. Modified terms of post-tenure reviews and promotion.
   a. The University requirement of reviews of tenured faculty at least every five years (Policy 2-005-Sec. 5-C) applies to faculty members serving some or all of that time in a part-time status.
   b. The criteria and standards for promotion in rank subsequent to granting of tenure shall ordinarily be the same as for full-time faculty except the time allowed to achieve the standards shall be increased.

F. Procedures for requesting one-year partial leaves, two-year temporary part-time status or permanent part-time positions.
1. New Appointments. In the process of interviewing for or negotiating an offer, a candidate for a new appointment at the University of Utah may request consideration of a part-time arrangement, of any of the three types permitted by this Policy (one-year partial leave, two-year temporary renewable, or permanent if appointed with tenure).
   a. A request for a permanent part-time position shall be subject to the approval of the departmental faculty appointments advisory committee (and committee votes shall be taken as to the part-time status as well as the appointment, tenure, and rank, pursuant to Policy 6-302-II-C-2).
   b. The terms of a part-time arrangement if requested at the time of initial appointment shall be detailed in the letter of offer or in a memorandum of understanding concluded before the candidate begins employment.
   c. If the terms of a part-time arrangement will include modification of any otherwise applicable criteria, standards, or procedure of formal review for
tenure or promotion, such RPT modifications must be approved by the chair of the departmental RPT Advisory Committee as well as the department chair, and the cognizant dean and vice president. Unless the department chair and RPT Committee chair determine that circumstances require expedited procedures and it is impractical to convene the RPT Advisory Committee, such RPT modifications shall also be approved by a majority of the departmental RPT Advisory Committee. Such modifications shall be specified in an RPT memorandum as described in part III-F-2 below, to be included in the faculty member’s RPT file.

2. Existing Faculty—Procedures (see Part III-B for procedures for partial leave of one-year or less).
   a. A request from an existing full-time faculty member for a part-time arrangement (temporary, or permanent if already tenured) shall be submitted in writing to the department chairperson (or equivalent). This request letter shall describe the reasons for seeking a part-time arrangement, specify the proposed starting date for part-time status, specify whether the request is for permanent or temporary part-time status, and if temporary shall specify the proposed duration of part-time status (including the calendar date for reverting to full-time status). The request letter shall be copied to the cognizant vice president to provide notice that a request is under consideration, and enable the vice president’s office to provide guidance on further processing of the request.

   b. Documentation of workload and compensation terms for part-time faculty. A memorandum of understanding ("workload memorandum") shall be prepared for each faculty member in temporary or permanent part-time status, documenting the terms of the planned annual workload of the faculty member with respect to teaching, departmental, college and University service, and any other duties, the financial compensation and employee benefits while part-time, and any special terms associated with the status. The terms shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of this Policy, particularly the principle of proportionality. The workload memorandum shall specify the period of time for which it is applicable (which is a maximum of two years for temporary part-time status). This workload memorandum shall be separate from the RPT memorandum described in Part III-F-2-c below. This workload memorandum (and any subsequent changes of its primary terms) shall be approved and signed by the department chairperson, and the part-time faculty member, and then, with the faculty member’s request letter, shall be submitted for approval by the cognizant dean and vice president. The office of the vice president shall provide guidance in the appropriate formulation of such memoranda.

   c. Procedures for approving modified terms for RPT reviews. For any case in which a faculty member will be part-time longer than a one-year partial leave of absence at partial pay, a separate memorandum of understanding about RPT modifications ("RPT memorandum") shall be
approved prior to the beginning of the part-time status.

i. In the case of a faculty member in the pre-tenure probationary period, the RPT memorandum shall describe with particularity the manner in which the RPT criteria, standards, and procedures otherwise applicable to probationary candidates in the academic unit will be modified for the affected candidate. At a minimum the RPT memorandum shall describe any modifications to be made to the otherwise applicable terms as to length of the probationary period, schedule of formal and informal reviews, and standards for quantity (but not quality) of accomplishments of the candidate. Any such modifications shall be consistent with the requirements, purposes and principles of this Policy, particularly the principle of proportionality, and consistent with the purposes of other Policies regarding RPT (See 6-303, 6-311). The RPT memorandum (and any subsequent changes of its primary terms) shall be approved by majority vote of the departmental RPT Advisory Committee, and approved and signed by the candidate, the department RPT Advisory Committee chairperson, the department chairperson, and the cognizant dean and vice president.

ii. For any case in which modifications in RPT procedures, criteria, or standards are made for a tenured faculty member serving temporarily or permanently in part-time status, such as an increase of time in those units that specify an expected time for achieving promotion in rank, an RPT memorandum describing such modifications shall be approved at or before the beginning of the part-time status. The RPT memorandum (and any subsequent changes of its primary terms) shall be approved by the part-time faculty member, the departmental RPT Advisory Committee chairperson, the department chairperson, and the cognizant dean and vice president.

iii. An approved RPT memorandum shall be included in the candidate’s RPT file along with the otherwise applicable departmental Statement of RPT Criteria, Standards, and Procedures (as per Policy 6-303).

iv. The office of the vice president shall provide guidance in the appropriate formulation of such RPT memoranda, and may consult with the University RPT Standards Committee in developing such guidance.

G. Rights, responsibilities, and benefits for part-time faculty.

1. Voting rights and roles and responsibilities in shared governance.

a. Each faculty member serving in a part-time status pursuant to this Policy at .5 FTE or greater shall: (i) have the same participation and voting rights as a full-time faculty member in the shared governance structure of the appointing academic department and college (or library equivalent), including advisory committees regarding appointments, retention, promotion, or tenure of faculty, and committees regarding curricular or other policy; and (ii) have the same eligibility as a full-time faculty member to be elected or appointed to
representative roles within a department, college, and the University (including a college council, Graduate or Undergraduate Council, the Academic Senate, and Senate committees or other University committees), unless otherwise specified in another University Policy or in the charge of a specified University committee.

b. Faculty members in a part-time status under this Policy are ordinarily expected to attend the general faculty meetings of their appointing unit. Other committee service and shared governance responsibilities of part-time faculty shall be generally proportional to those of full-time faculty.

2. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities.

Unless expressly stated to the contrary in this or another Policy, part-time faculty members have the same rights and responsibilities under University policies as full-time faculty members. Express statements of applicability to part-time faculty members appear in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (Policy 6-316, Sec. 1-C), Conflict of Interest Policy (1-006), and Patents and Inventions Policy (7-002, Sec. III-B-1.) inter alia.

3. Academic benefits and privileges.

a. Grants and awards. Part-time faculty members are eligible for any internal University grants and awards available to full-time faculty (unless otherwise specified in another governing University Policy or in the official announcement of a particular such grant or award opportunity, with good cause stated for limiting eligibility to full-time faculty).

b. Sabbatical leaves, parental leaves, and other leaves of absence. Part-time faculty members are eligible for any sabbatical leaves or other leaves of absence on the same terms as full-time faculty, unless otherwise specified in another governing University Policy.

4. Retirement, insurance, and other employee benefits.

Part-time faculty members are eligible to participate in these benefits programs on the same terms as other employees of the same FTE. This may exclude some benefits received by full-time employees, such as tuition reduction, sick leave, and vacation. See Part III-B above regarding the effect a qualifying partial leave of absence at partial pay of one year or less will have on benefits eligibility. A faculty member whose position is otherwise at .5 FTE or above shall not lose benefits solely as a result of temporarily falling below that level as a result of taking a sabbatical or parental leave. Current benefits are listed in Policy 5-308. Faculty members should consult with Human Resources for further information about the particular terms and extent of such benefits.

H. Reports.

1. The numbers of part-time and full-time regular faculty, including library faculty, within the scope of this Policy, shall be included in the administration’s annual “report to the Academic Senate on the faculty make-up by category” described in Policy 6-300-III-Sec. 5.
2. Three years after the first effective date of this Policy, a report regarding its implementation shall be made to the Academic Senate.

IV. V. VI. VII. {rules, references, history, contacts.}

* * * * * * * * * * *
University Policy 6-300: University Faculty. Revision 154 Effective date: [?? July 1, 2011]

I. Purpose and scope. [reserved]
II. Definitions. [reserved]
III. Policy.

.... {...Drafting note: other lengthy passages which are not proposed for revision are not duplicated here. See them in the full version of the current Policy at
http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-300.html}

Section 2. Regular Faculty - Tenured and Tenure-Eligible Faculty

Appointees to the regular faculty shall commit full time (or part-time if explicitly so appointed per Policy 6-320) to the scholarly (or creative), educational, and service endeavors carried on under the auspices of the University. In light of the centrality of free inquiry and free expression in the development and dissemination of knowledge, they shall have tenure or be eligible for tenure (except instructors). In light of the interrelationship of the development and dissemination of knowledge, they shall bear the primary responsibility for carrying on the educational research, creative and service missions of the University. The regular faculty shall include professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors (who shall not have tenure) and the following categories of honored faculty: Distinguished Professor, Presidential Professor, and University Professor.

.......

Section 3. Library Faculty

Appointees to the library faculty shall commit full time (or part-time if explicitly so appointed per Policy 6-320) to support of the University's teaching and research program, professional growth and scholarly or creative activity, and service to the University and community. They shall have continuing appointment or be eligible for continuing appointment. Library faculty shall include academic librarians with the rank of librarian, associate librarian, and assistant librarian.

.......

Section 5. Uniform use of Categories and Reports of Instructional Activities

It is crucial to the permanent well-being of the University that tenured and tenure-track faculty continue to shoulder the primary responsibility for design of the curriculum and for instruction at all levels of university education.

The administration shall report annually to the Academic Senate on the faculty make-up by category, and this report shall include the relative proportion of regular and academic library faculty in part-time or full-time positions.

An assessment will be made annually by the Academic Senate of the effects of faculty composition on this central principle.

.......

IV. V. VI. VII. {rules, references, history, contacts.}

* * * * * * * * * * * 
Proposal to revise 6-314.

Drafting Note: These are the changes proposed to be made to existing Policy 6-314 Section 12 in conjunction with the adoption of new 6-320. The description of procedures here for requesting a partial leave is modified to refer over to the detailed procedures description given in the new 6-320, and the section regarding a faculty member ‘releasing’ the University from its obligation to pay full-time salary is deleted here because replaced by an essentially similar provision included in the new 6-320 for permanent part-time positions.

University Policy 6-314 Leaves of Absence. Revision 67, Effective date: [?? July 1, 2011]

I. Purpose and Scope.
II. Definitions [reserved]
III. Policy
   [Sections 1-11-- Other voluminous Sections of 6-314 which are not proposed for revision are not reproduced here. They may be seen at http://www.regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-314.html]

Section 12. Partial Leaves of Absence with Partial Pay
   A. Policy
      A faculty member or academic librarian may request a partial leave of absence entailing release from one third, one half or some other fraction of normal full-time duties, with a corresponding reduction in regular full-time salary. A request for partial leave of absence with partial pay, or a request for renewal of such a leave, should be submitted and reviewed for possible final approval in the manner provided in Section 11, above (Leaves of Absence Without Pay). Requests for partial leaves below .75 full time equivalent, for which an increase of a pre-tenure probationary period or post-tenure review period is desired, must be made under Policy 6-320.

   B. Change to Permanent Part-Time Appointment
      If a faculty member or an academic librarian wishes to retain an appointment on a less than full-time basis after the termination of, or without receiving approval for, a partial leave of absence with partial pay, the individual concerned must submit to the cognizant supervisor a written statement permanently releasing the university from any future obligation to provide the requesting individual with more than a stipulated fraction of a regular full-time salary. If the cognizant supervisor approves the individual's proposal, he/she shall forward it, with a recommendation for its disposition, through regular administrative channels to the president. If the president concurs in the request, it shall be submitted to the Board of Trustees for final approval.
February 16, 2011

TO: David Pershing  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR: John Francis  
Chair, Undergraduate Council

RE: Emphases for Chemistry

At its meeting of Tuesday, February 15, 2011, the Undergraduate Council approved a proposal from the Department of Chemistry for eight transcripted emphases. The proposal and supporting letters are attached.

We are asking you, if you also approve of the proposal, to forward it on to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for their consideration.
January 25, 2011

Pierre Sokolsky, Dean  
College of Science  
University of Utah  
CAMPUS

Dear Dean Sokolsky,

I am writing to support the formal recognition of the various ways to complete the chemistry major as Emphases to be listed on a student’s transcript.

The full faculty in chemistry voted to support the proposal to have each of the following degree programs listed as a transcripted emphasis:

A. Chemistry, Professional  
B. Chemistry, Biological  
C. Chemistry, Business  
D. Chemistry, Chemical Physics  
E. Chemistry, Geology  
F. Chemistry, Materials Science & Engineering  
G. Chemistry, Mathematics  
H. Chemistry, Teaching

All chemistry majors consist of a core set of courses and the particular flavor of the chemistry major is defined by the indicated course work in specific areas relevant to the field in the attached proposal. All of these paths to the chemistry degree have long been in place, but approval of this proposal will allow the full nature of the course of study to be indicated on a transcript. We believe this change will help students in the job market and as they apply to graduate and professional programs.

We are asking for your approval and a letter of support for these emphases so that the proposal can be forwarded to the administration and the Board of Regents.

Sincerely,

Henry S. White  
Distinguished Professor and Chair
Section I: Action

The Chemistry Department at the University of Utah proposes to offer eight emphases in Chemistry to reflect the breadth and diversity of the degree programs that have historically been offered in the department. As is current practice, students must complete the Core Requirements and one of the indicated emphases to earn the chemistry degree. Approval of these emphases will enable the precise nature of each student’s degree program to be indicated on his/her transcript.

Proposed Emphases for Chemistry Majors

Core Requirements for the Chemistry Major
Chemistry Core Courses (required of all majors):
CHEM 1210, 1220 General Chemistry I, II (4, 4)
CHEM 1215, 1225 General Chemistry Lab I, II (1, 1)
CHEM 2310, 2320 Organic Chemistry I, II (4, 4)
CHEM 2315, 2325 Organic Chemistry Lab I, II (2, 2)
CHEM 3000 Quantitative Analysis (4)
CHEM 3060 Quantum Chemistry and Spectroscopy (4)
CHEM 3100 Inorganic Chemistry (5)

Math and Physics Core (required of all majors)
MATH 1210, 1220, 2210 Calculus I, II, III (4, 4, 3)
PHYS 2210, 2220 Physics for Scientists and Engineers I, II (4, 4)
PHYS 2215, 2225 Physics Laboratory for Scientists and Engineers I, II (1, 1)

A. Chemistry, Professional Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
MATH 2250 Differential Equations and Linear Algebra (4)
MATH 3150 Partial Differential Equations for Engineering Students (2)
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4)
CHEM 3510 Biological Chemistry I (3)

Five laboratory courses selected from the following:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 3515 Biological Chemistry Lab (2)
or 3525 Molecular Biology of DNA Lab (3)
CHEM 4800 Undergraduate Research (2)
or CHEM 4999 Honors Thesis/Project (3)

B. Chemistry, Biological Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
BIOL 2020 Principles of Cell Biology (3)
BIOL 2030 Genetics (3)
BIOL 3510 Biological Chemistry I (3)
BIOL 3515 Biological Chemistry Laboratory (2)
or BIOL 3525 Molecular Biology of DNA Lab (3)
BIOL 3520 Biological Chemistry II (3)
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4)
or CHEM 3090 Biophysical Chemistry (3)

Five or more semester units selected from approved Biology courses numbered 3000 or higher. Selected chemistry graduate level courses may be used to fulfill this requirement with the approval of the chemistry advisor.

Two laboratory courses selected from:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

C. Chemistry, Business Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4)
or CHEM 3090 Biophysical Chemistry (3)

Two laboratory courses selected from:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

Twelve or more units selected from the College of Business
(Business Minor courses are recommended)

D. Chemistry, Chemical Physics Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4)
MATH 2250 Differential Equations and Linear Algebra (4)
MATH 3150 Partial Differential Equations for Engineers (2)
MATH 3160 Complex Variables for Engineers (2)
MATH Elective (3 credits) chosen in consultation with the chemistry advisor

Two laboratory courses selected from:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)
Six or more units selected from the following:
CHEM 7000 Introduction to Quantum Mechanics I (2)
CHEM 7010 Introduction to Quantum Mechanics II (2)
CHEM 7020 Introduction to Spectroscopy I (2)
CHEM 7030 Introduction to Spectroscopy II (2)
CHEM 7040 Statistical Thermodynamics (2)
CHEM 7050 Classical Thermodynamics (2)
CHEM 7070 Chemical Kinetics (2)
CHEM 7080 Chemical Dynamics (2)

E. Chemistry, Geology Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4)

Two laboratory courses selected from:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

Twelve or more units selected from the following:
GEO 1110 Physical Geology (3)
GEO 3060 Structural Geology and Tectonics (3)
GEO 3080 Earth Materials I (4)
GEO 3090 Earth Materials II (4)
GEO 4100 Petrography and Petrogenesis (3)
GEO 5450 Ore Genesis and Mineral Exploration (3)
GEO 5660 Geochemistry (3)
GEO 5670 Isotope Tracers in Earth Science (3)

F. Chemistry, Materials Science and Engineering Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
MATH 2250 Differential Equations and Linear Algebra (4)
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4)

Two laboratory courses selected from:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

Fifteen or more units selected from the following:
MSE 2010 Introduction to Materials Science and Engineering (4)
MSE 3010 Materials Processing Lab (3)
MSE 3210 Electronic Properties of Solids (3)
MSE 3310 Introduction to Ceramics (3)
MSE 3410 Introduction to Polymers (3)
MSE 5011 Adv Mtrls Tech: Experiment, Theory & Characterization (2)
MSE 5032 Advanced Thermodynamics (3)
MSE 5034 Kinetics of Solid-state Processes (3)
MSE 5470 Polymer & Organic Materials fro Renewable energy Application I (3)

G. Chemistry, Mathematics Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4)
MATH 2250 Differential Equations and Linear Algebra (4)
MATH 3150 Partial Differential Equations for Engineers (2)
MATH 3160 Applied Complex Variables (2)
MATH Elective (3 credits) chosen in consultation with the chemistry advisor

Two laboratory courses selected from:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

Six or more units selected from the following:
MATH 5010 Introduction to Probability (3)
MATH 5080 Statistical Inference I (3)
MATH 5090 Statistical Inference II (3)
MATH 5210 Introduction to Real Analysis (4)
MATH 5600 Survey of Numerical Analysis (4)
MATH 5610 Introduction to Numerical Analysis I (4)
MATH 5620 Introduction to Numerical Analysis II (4)

H. Chemistry, Teaching Emphasis
Core courses, plus:
CHEM 3070 Thermodynamics and Chemical Kinetics (4)
   or CHEM 3090 Biophysical Chemistry (3)

Two laboratory courses selected from:
CHEM 5700 Advanced Analytical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5710 Advanced Organic Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5720 Advanced Physical Chemistry Lab (2)
CHEM 5730 Advanced Inorganic Chemistry Lab (2)

Teaching Major, Minor, Certification. Please refer to Education in the Colleges section for information on teaching major and minor course requirements and state secondary teacher certification.
Section II: Need

Since long before the transition to semesters, the chemistry department has offered students a variety of ways to complete the requirements for the Chemistry Degree but there has not been a way to indicate this information on a transcript until the recently approved mechanism involving emphases. There is a common core for all chemistry majors and the unique flavor of each emphasis is indicated by name assigned to each emphasis.

The Professional and Biological Emphases are certified by the American Chemical Society as meeting ACS standards for a traditional chemistry major and a biochemistry major, respectively. It should be noted that the Biochemistry Department on campus does not offer an undergraduate degree program so including the Biological Emphasis on a transcript is important to our students. With an annual production of approximately 60 chemistry graduates, the Chemistry Department ranks in the top ten in the nation with about 50 ACS Certified graduates in a typical year.

Recognition of the other options (Business, Chemical Physics, Geology, Materials Science and Engineering, Mathematics and Teaching) on a transcript will make clear that students completing these degree programs have had an exposure to diverse fields where chemical training matters. Students have frequently requested that the precise nature of their chemistry degree be indicated on their transcripts so this change should help students as they apply to graduate and professional programs or pursue a career in the chemical sciences.

Section III: Institutional Impact

There will be no impact to the department or institution as these degree programs are already in place and we have sufficient advising resources to direct students to the appropriate program of study..

Section IV: Finances

There will be no financial impact to the department or institution.
Henry S. White  
Distinguished Professor and Chair of Chemistry

Pierre V. Sokolsky  
Dean, College of Science  
Professor of Physics

David W. Pershing  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Michael K. Young  
President  
University of Utah
January 31, 2011

Dr. John G. Francis  
Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs  
and Undergraduate Studies  
Undergraduate Council  
Sterling Still Center  
CAMPUS

Dear John:

I strongly support the Department of Chemistry's enclosed proposal to offer eight emphases in Chemistry to reflect the breadth and diversity of the degree programs that have historically been offered in the department (see below). The detailed description and list of requirements are included in the proposal.

Chemistry, Professional  
Chemistry, Biological  
Chemistry, Business  
Chemistry, Chemical Physics  
Chemistry, Geology  
Chemistry, Materials Science and Engineering  
Chemistry, Mathematics  
Chemistry, Teaching

As Chemistry Chair Henry White's Jan. 25 letter states, all chemistry majors consist of a core set of courses and the particular flavor of the chemistry major is defined by the indicated course work in specific areas relevant to the field in the proposal. All of these paths to the chemistry degree have long been in place, but approval of this proposal will allow the full nature of the course of study to be indicated on a transcript. This change will help students in the job market and as they apply to graduate and professional programs.

If you have any questions about this proposal, please feel free to contact Chemistry Chair Henry White <chair@chemistry.utah.edu> or his assistant, Debbie Olson, at 801-581-3164.

Sincerely,  

[Signature]  

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

College of Science - Office of the Dean  
1430 East Presidents Circle, Sm. 220 (ITB), Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0140  
(801) 581-6958 • FAX (801) 585-3169 • http://www.science.utah.edu
February 18, 2011

TO: David Pershing  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR: John Francis  
Chair, Undergraduate Council

RE: Emphases for Geology & Geophysics

At its meeting of Tuesday, February 15, 2011, the Undergraduate Council approved a proposal from the Department of Geology and Geophysics to have three transcripted emphases. The proposal, with supporting letters, is attached.

We are asking you, if you also approve of the proposal, to forward it on to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for their consideration.
January 31, 2011

Ed Barbanell  
Edward.barbanell@utah.edu  
Office of Undergraduate Studies  
Sterling Sill Center  
195 S. Central Campus Dr., Rm 00132  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear Dr. Barbanell:

I am writing to endorse strongly the proposal by the Department of Geology and Geophysics to include the following emphasis areas on the BS Geoscience Degree, Geology and Geophysics transcripts:

Geology

Environmental Geoscience

Geophysics

The new Geoscience degree has become very popular and is one reason that majors in Geology and Geophysics have nearly doubled over the past 6 years. By including the above emphasis areas on a students transcript we will further promote the flexibility of this major while at the same time recognizing specific areas in which a student has studied.

Sincerely,

Francis H. Brown, Dean
January 31, 2011

Ed Barbanell
801-585-6423
edward.barbanell@utah.edu
Office of Undergraduate Studies
Sterling Sill Center
195 S. Central Campus Dr., RM00132
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dr. Barbanell

The Department of Geology and Geophysics (GEO) at the University of Utah proposes that the following emphasis areas be entered on the BS Geoscience Degree, Geology & Geophysics transcripts:

* Geology
* Environmental Geoscience
* Geophysics

This will allow the Emphasis Areas be listed on transcripts, DARS and Declared Majors Status.

Attached is our proposal assembled according to the guidelines found on the New Programs/Program Tracking web page (Office of Undergraduate Studies). The proposal has been reviewed by the Geology & Geophysics Undergraduate Affairs Committee.

Please let me know if anything else is required at this time and if everything seems to be in order for consideration at the next Undergraduate Council Meeting.

Erich Petersen, Professor
Chair, Undergraduate Affairs Committee
Request

Emphases Designations

In Undergraduate

Geoscience

Degree

Department of Geology & Geophysics

College of Mines and Earth Sciences

115 S. 1460 E. Rm 383
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

January 30, 2011

Tracking:

Department of Geology & Geophysics: January 30
Undergraduate Council: February 15
Graduate Council: February 28
Senate: March 7
Board of Trustees
Board of Regents: March 25
Section I: Action

The Department of Geology and Geophysics (GEO) at the University of Utah proposes that the following emphasis areas be entered on the BS Geoscience Degree, Geology & Geophysics transcripts:

* Geology
* Environmental Geoscience
* Geophysics

This will allow the Emphasis Areas be listed on transcripts, DARS and Declared Majors Status.

All students electing the Geoscience Major are required to complete a common set of core courses that constitute 28 credit hours of the 81 credit hours in the major. The balance of the credit hours (53) accrues in courses from one of three emphasis areas. Each emphasis area add 12 additional required credit hours, 12 credit hours of degree-program electives and 29 credit hours of allied courses in Mathematics, Chemistry, and Physics. The balance of the courses to meet the University of Utah required minimum of 122 credit hours for any undergraduate degree are accrued through university-required courses and electives.

CORE Courses (28 Credit hours, Required for all Geoscience majors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Hrs.</th>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEO 1110</td>
<td>Introduction to Earth Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Must register for GEO 1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 1115</td>
<td>Introduction to Earth Systems Lab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 3080</td>
<td>Earth Materials I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CHEM 1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 3090</td>
<td>Earth Materials II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GEO 1110, GEO 3080, MATH 1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 3060</td>
<td>Structural Geology and Tectonics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 3010</td>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MATH 1220, Co-GEO 3080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 5760</td>
<td>Stratigraphy and Sedimentary Processes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GEO 3090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 4500</td>
<td>Field Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GEO 3060; Upper Division CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO 4510</td>
<td>Field Geology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GEO 4500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion of the requirements in an emphasis area is an integral part of the Geoscience degree. Requirements for each emphasis area are given below. Each emphasis area consists of a body of courses that total 53 credit hours. Electives: Any upper division course in the Colleges of Mines and Earth Sciences, Science, or Engineering, or other upper division course by approval. (Approved electives in College of Social Behavioral Sciences: GEOG 3110, 3140,
Section II: Need

Listing Emphasis Areas on transcripts would bring recognition to the area of study. When students apply for employment or to graduate school, having the specific emphasis designation on the transcript would make it easier to determine the professional area in which the candidate has expertise and professional preparation.

The Geology Emphasis provides the greatest flexibility for the student. Students may explore the diversity of the field or focus more tightly to gain greater depth of understanding.

The Environmental Emphasis focuses on connections and interactions with the biosphere, hydrosphere and atmosphere providing the student with a strong background to contribute to addressing environmental issues in society. Courses in Biology, Hydrology and Atmospheric sciences contribute to its interdisciplinary nature.

The Geophysics Emphasis is for students that desire to the study Earth’s interior using a highly quantitative approach. This body of knowledge is applied to the study of geological hazards (e.g., earthquakes) and resource exploration (metals and energy resources).

The Geoscience Degree was the result of merging three separate degrees into one degree with three emphasis areas. This degree was simpler to market and allows more room for electives making it easier for transfer students to enter the program and for students to pursue dual majors. We believe that it has also resulted in the desired increase of majors.

Section III: Institutional Impact

This proposal will have no institutional impact.

Section IV: Finances

There will be no financial impact to the Department of Geology & Geophysics or the College of Mines and Earth Sciences. The emphases areas have been in place since 2005. This proposal only seeks that the Emphasis Areas be listed on transcripts, DARS and Declared Majors Status.
## Geoscience Emphases

### Geology Emphasis (53 credit hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional required courses</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GEO 1220  
Earth History              | 3  | GEO 1110, 1115 |
| GEO = 9 credits, upper division | 9  |               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree program electives</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Credit hours</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Allied Science Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CHEM 1210  
Chemistry I                  | 4  |
| CHEM 1215  
Chemistry I Lab             | 1  |
| CHEM 1220  
Chemistry II                | 4  |
| CHEM 1225  
Chemistry II Lab            | 1  |
| MATH 1210  
Calculus I                  | 4  |
| MATH 1220  
Calculus II                 | 4  |
| METEN 3070 - OR  
Statistics                   | 3  |
| MATH 3070  
Statistics I (4)            |    |
| PHYS 2210  
Physics for Sci/Eng. I      | 4  |
| PHYS 2220  
Physics for Sci/Eng. II     | 4  |
**Environmental Geoscience Emphasis (53 credit hours)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional required courses</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Prerequisite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 credits among following 3 areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum of 3 credits in each area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Biosphere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(see footnote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hydrosphere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(see footnote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Atmosphere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(see footnote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 additional credits from 1, 2, or 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Degree program electives                                             | 12 |                                                                             |
| Degree program electives                                             |    |                                                                             |
| Degree program electives                                             | 12 |                                                                             |

| Allied Science Requirements                                          | 29 |                                                                             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|                                                                             |
| CHEM 1210                                                           |    | Chemistry I 4                                                               |
| CHEM 1215                                                           |    | Chemistry I Lab 1 Co-CHEM 1210                                              |
| CHEM 1220                                                           |    | Chemistry II 4                                                              |
| CHEM 1225                                                           |    | Chemistry II Lab 1 Co-CHEM 1220                                             |
| MATH 1210                                                           |    | Calculus I 4                                                                |
| MATH 1220                                                           |    | Calculus II 4                                                               |
| MATH 1210                                                           |    | "C" or better in MATH 1050 AND MATH 1060 OR Math ACT score of at least 28 OR |
|                                                                   |    | Math SAT score of at least 630 OR AP Calculus AB score of at least 3         |
| MATH 1220                                                           |    | "C" or better in MATH 1210 OR MATH 1250 OR MATH 1270 OR AP Calculus BC score |
|                                                                   |    | of at least 4 OR AP Calculus BC score of at least 3                         |
| METEN 3070 - OR                                                     |    | Statistics 3                                                                |
| MATH 3070                                                           |    | Statistics I (4) "C" or better in MATH 1220 OR MATH 1250 OR MATH 1270 OR AP  |
|                                                                   |    | Calculus BC score of at least 4                                              |
| PHYS 2210                                                           |    | Physics for Sci/Eng. I 4 MATH 1210                                           |
| PHYC 2220                                                           |    | Physics for Sci/Eng. II 4 MATH 1220, PHYS 2210                               |
1. Biosphere: Choose from courses such as GEO 3180 (pre-req. GEO 1110); BIOL 1210, 1330, 1400, 2010, 2020 (pre-req. BIOL 1210 (or equivalent) and BIOL 2010, and CHEM 1210), or 3410.

2. Hydrosphere: Choose from courses such as GEO 3300, 3800 (pre-req. GEO 1110), 5370 (pre-req. CHEM 1210, 1220 or consent), 5350 (pre-req. MATH 1220), and 5390 (pre-req. GEO 3080, 3090, 3400, 5350, 5360, 5370, Co- 5385, 5500).

3. Atmosphere: Choose from courses such as ATMOS 3000, 3100 (pre-req. CHEM 1210, MATH 1220, and PHYS 2210, or Instructor's consent), 5400, and GEOG 3210.
### Geophysics Emphasis (53 credit hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional required courses</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 credits among following 3 areas:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course in each area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismology</td>
<td>3 (see footnote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Fields</td>
<td>3 (see footnote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (see footnote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 5600 or GEO 5560</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree program electives</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Credit hours</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Allied Science Requirements | 29 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 1210</td>
<td>Chemistry I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1210</td>
<td>Calculus I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 1220</td>
<td>Calculus II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 2210</td>
<td>Calculus III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 2250</td>
<td>ODEs &amp; Lin. Alg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METEN 3070 – OR</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 3070</td>
<td>Statistics I (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 2210</td>
<td>Physics for Sci/Eng I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 2220</td>
<td>Physics for Sci/Eng II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geophysics: One course from GEO 5211, 5250, 5260, 5310, and 5320
The Undergraduate Council has completed its study of the Behavioral Science and Health Program.

The External Review Committee was:

Dr. Lori Carter-Edwards, Director
Health Promotion and Disease Prevention in the Division of Community Health in the Department of Community and Family Medicine
Duke University

Dr. Janet Porter, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

The Internal Review Committee was:

Dr. Leslie Francis, Professor
Department of Philosophy
College of Law
University of Utah

Dr. Lucy Savitz, Associate Professor
Clinical Epidemiology
University of Utah

Dr. Charlene Weir, Research Associate Professor
Department of Biomedical Informatics
School of Medicine
University of Utah

1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Mission and Organization. The Behavioral Science and Health (BS&H) program, located within the College of Social and Behavioral Science, offers an interdisciplinary major
combining a variety of perspectives on health and the functioning of the health care system. It
takes as its starting point the multidimensional character of human health. The website states that
the program is “designed to provide students with the broad, interdisciplinary foundation for
understanding health and to sensitively and effectively address health care issues in
multidimensional contexts.” Students gain familiarity with the fields related to health, providing
them an opportunity to achieve a favorable position from which to make appropriate career
choices.

The BS&H major is interdepartmental in structure, and courses are drawn almost exclusively
from the following departments: Anthropology; Biology; Economics; Family and Consumer
Studies; Family and Preventative Medicine; Gerontology; Geography; Health Education;
Management; Marketing; Nutrition; Philosophy; Political Science; Psychology; and Sociology.
Current and prospective students are able to learn about the curriculum and course offerings
through the program website.

Students are provided an opportunity to complete an optional internship to gain practical
experience in their area of choice. However, internships have declined over the past 15 years,
with only 1-5 students signing up each semester; this may be due to the fact that most internships
are unpaid. In the students’ senior year, a capstone course, introduced to the program in 2004, is
offered to help them integrate what they learned from different disciplines; provide them fluency
in health issues and competence for applying for jobs or graduate school; and interact with
speakers from the larger community of Utah to provide them with career direction.

The multidisciplinary nature of the BS&H program is an asset for the students, as evidenced by
their enthusiasm and high level of satisfaction with the program’s flexibility in meeting their
diverse needs and backgrounds. Students are also appreciative of the program’s ability to cover
current issues in the courses, as well as the opportunity to gain analytic and writing skills.
Another advantage of the program’s structure is that it allows students to explore possible career
directions through various disciplines.

The program is geared toward students who are already employed either half or full-time. Of the
160-200 students enrolled in the program each year, approximately 80% of the graduates obtain
jobs after graduation, and 40% go on to graduate studies. The vast majority of students obtain
jobs in Utah in health-related organizations. Jobs obtained range from administration to
coordination and management to technology.

2. GOVERNANCE AND PLANNING

 Governance. The program is led by two co-directors, appointed to accommodate the
multidisciplinary nature of the program and manage and update the curriculum including the
capstone course. The current co-directors are Dr Polly Wiessner from the Anthropology
Department and Dr. Norman Waitzman from the Economics Department.

The program has an Advisory Board that meets annually and is composed of representatives
from departments from which program classes are identified. Members of the board are selected
by the co-directors. Some Board members teach courses taken by BS&H students, but others do not. A major role of the Board is to recommend speakers for the capstone course. Several members of the Board believe that more frequent meetings (at least one/semester) would be helpful. Another suggestion was to create a way to link faculty across campus with similar interests in the overall area of health policy so that shared research and teaching interests can be identified and explored.

At the time of the review, the Program had not established a student SAC. Although the reported explanation was lack of student interest, the students interviewed expressed enthusiasm for this opportunity to participate in Program governance. The Program co-directors are entirely willing to support students in this enterprise and had not realized the advantages of a SAC for the Program, for example, that SACs may seek support from ASUU for student activities.

**Program Planning.** Since the structure of the BS&H program is interdepartmental in nature, cooperation across disciplines is critical to plan and evaluate course offerings for BS&H students. To keep abreast of developments in behavioral sciences and health, the curriculum must be adapted each year, and participating departments must provide information on new courses and whether they plan to offer or cancel existing courses. Although the faculty’s departments benefit from the course credits received by teaching BS&H students, the program is completely reliant on the availability of faculty courses developed for their primary disciplines. Cooperation across disciplines has been positive, as indicated in the self-study, discussions with faculty, and reported evidence of course credits students received from participating disciplines. At the annual meeting, the BS&H Advisory Board considers new courses for enrichment, evaluates program progress, and recommends speakers for the capstone course. The evaluations are both formal (e.g., a post-capstone course survey) and informal (e.g., discussions between faculty).

Since the capstone course is the core of the program and synthesizes material learned across the classes, the program plans to add evaluative measures in 2010 to aid in curriculum planning.

Marketing strategies are aimed at supporting the directional strategies of the Program, and it is recommended that a more formal marketing plan be developed. Few individuals know of the program outside of the program itself. Although there is no clear goal to grow the number of students, recent enrollment is down so marketing may be more important in the future. Word-of-mouth endures as the ultimate and most low cost marketing strategy. Supporting the creation of a community of satisfied students is one strategy that could advance this effort; suggestions include creation of a half day orientation for new and continuing students at the beginning of each academic year. The Program should also explore the potential for partnering with Admissions in their marketing, particularly targeting students eligible for the Western Undergraduate Exchange. Making the Webpage more dynamic offers another marketing opportunity.

Currently, no strategic plan has been developed to provide a framework for future Program planning and to guide governance. The program co-directors should be asked to develop such a plan in concert with their Advisory Board and the College of Social and Behavioral Science. The strategic plan should include a clear succession plan for directors, advisory board members,
and instructors; should identify proximal and distal goals with measurable outcomes; and should clearly link the program to the overall mission of the University. Resources to support this strategic planning process may be needed, for example, funding for an outside consultant.

3. FACULTY

Approximately 50 faculty members in various departments within the University of Utah offer 45 courses in the BS&H program. The faculty represented on the advisory board seems very enthusiastic and supportive of the BS&H program. The program itself has no faculty of its own, so scholarship and service are evaluated by the co-directors from faculty CVs. Diversity of the BS&H program faculty is low as it is for the University of Utah as a whole.

Two associate instructors who are PhD level graduate students assist with the organization and teaching of capstone classes and are critical to the program operation. Invited guest lectures in the capstone classes are provided by leaders in health care, public health and health policy. Associate instructors lead the discussion sessions which are periodically attended by the co-directors of the BS&H program. Students rate the teaching effectiveness of the associate instructors as much higher than that for the University as a whole.

4. STUDENTS

The departmental review sheet indicates that most students are white, female (76%) and enrolled full time. Nearly half of the students are transfers, primarily from the city college system. The average GPA of students, whether current or transfer, is 3.0. Transfers within the system are students seeking a more diverse academic experience that better meets their career plans. The number of BS&H majors has decreased since 2004-2005, with a slight increase in 2008-2009. Advisory Board members as well as students believe this is due to economic changes, where students and their families are forced to make the choice between employment and school. Another possible explanation may be related to the increasing number of interdisciplinary majors offered at the University in recent years. Few individuals outside of the program itself know of the BS&H Program. It is recommended that a more formal marketing plan be developed aimed at supporting the directional strategies of the program.

During recruitment visits at the Major Expo and Salt Lake Community College, the BS&H advisor and an associate instructor have an opportunity for in-depth discussions about the BS&H Program. These events provide an opportunity to make contacts with minority students whose numbers are still very small in the program. University of Utah students must be in “good standing” when admitted to the BS&H program. The program helps support working students by offering some students tuition waivers and scholarships.

Given the multidisciplinary nature of the program, as well as the varying career goals of each student, student advising is reportedly intense, provided by the program advisor and the associate instructors. This gives students a great opportunity to have advising tailored to their specific needs. The Program advisor continues from one year to the next providing continuity in the advising process, and the associate instructors also provide detailed guidance for students.
Community building is somewhat of a problem in this program, given its individualized nature. The students interviewed noted that they did not become aware of each other until after several semesters. An early fall welcome/orientation that includes students across all cohorts could be offered in order to build community, allow for student networking, and emphasize key points/changes in the program. The orientation could include a keynote talk focusing on a major skill such as interviewing, negotiation, teamwork, time management, etc. Such an orientation could also emphasize University resources such as 1) the Institute for Healthcare Improvement Open School that offers monthly lectures by national experts in a Web-based learning format (the Utah Chapter is sponsored by the CCTS Community Engagement Core; 2) Students could be encouraged to submit posters and/or attend the annual Utah Health Services Research meeting.

4. CURRICULUM

The quality of the curriculum appears to be largely adequate, covering mandated content and a wide variety of classes from other programs. Required core courses in social epidemiology and health economics serve as an important backbone for the program and are reported by students as excellent in themselves and helping to establish an identity with the major. Students did not see a diminished quality of courses offered online versus in-person. Students wanted structured sessions based on specific types of jobs they are interested in.

The BS&H Program accesses a breadth of classes for the major leading to a degree, and the broad curriculum is appropriate given the purpose of the BS&H Program. The coursework appropriately covers the same areas required by the Council on Education in Public Health (CEPH). The BS&H requirements include coursework on research and ethical foundations; biological, cultural and global perspectives on health; politics, policy, resources, and administration; an elective; and the capstone course. The interdisciplinary nature of the Program is regarded as a great strength by both faculty and students. However, it would be helpful to engage in strategic planning to assess the program content based on core competencies in order to identify gaps and opportunities for program enhancement. One area that could be strengthened is analytic methods—an important competency area for employment and continued graduate studies.

The BS&H Program and the partnering departments benefit each other in that use of existing courses leverages resources allowing the BS&H Program to exist without additional resources. The goal of the faculty is to provide the best of classes from other disciplines, and they routinely search for new, innovative and creative classes in other related departments. Although the Program has clearly been successful in many of the courses identified, the process of selecting and evaluating these courses is done in a rather informal manner and is not as clear as it might be. It is recommended that the Program develop a more formal and systematic process for identifying new courses based on an assessment of competency based learning. Faculty members on the BS&H Advisory Board serve a vital link representing Program interests in their home departments. This role should be emphasized and communication of anticipated changes that impact Program curricular offerings should be periodically solicited at regular Advisory Board meetings.
An ongoing problem for the Program is that they cannot control courses offered by departments and are dependent on their offerings on decisions made outside of the Program. The impending retirement of a faculty member in Biology, for example, may prove problematic for the Program. Addressing this problem will require attention from the College of Social and Behavior Science and the University. Students express some difficulty in registering for courses, and faculty representatives should work with their home departments to extend the same registration priority to BS&H students as students in their own departments.

The flexible nature of the courses allows students to make choices. However, students indicated in discussions that in order to accommodate their work schedules they often have to make decisions about classes based on course availability rather than what course they really wanted to take. Since the majority of students work, it is recommended that Program leadership seek to indentify a mix of courses that are offered in-person, via the Web, and through some hybrid of these modalities in order to accommodate working students. Perhaps the Program could consider how departments like Sociology, Political Science, or Psychology have emphasized e-learning in their course offerings. These steps might also be helpful to maintain student enrollment and perhaps even increase the number of majors.

Internships are also offered to enrich the students’ experience. Such hands-on learning experiences are important to build resumes and demonstrate application of learned curricula. However, even though several identified internship opportunities exist, they are not well-advertised and few students use these opportunities. While Program orientation includes a brief overview of the internship, students seemed largely unaware of the opportunity. Further, students are “… required to make their own internship contacts” (BS&H 2009-2010 Program description, p. 2). Financial reasons may prevent some students from doing the special project which includes an optional internship. A staff person has been designated to oversee these student activities, but faculty involvement may be necessary if they are to be enhanced. The Program could also reach out to the community to identify internship opportunities (e.g., via Advisory Board and CCTS Community Engagement connections), promote internships internally with students, institute a formal internship evaluation process and cultivate sustained relationships with community placements. It may be an advantage to pursue this given the interest expressed by students, co-directors and faculty in boosting aspects of critical thinking in coursework.

The students generally like the capstone course experience; however they believe the course could be of even greater benefit if weekly coursework could be streamlined and structured to foster more critical thinking than just summarization skills. Interestingly, Advisory Board faculty are also interested in providing students with more critical thinking in their courses through exercises and training and by strengthening the role of research methods in coursework. Furthermore, they want to equip the students with the tools necessary for both graduate school and problem solving in their jobs. Advisory board faculty are also interested in more community connections with BS&H coursework such as providing more applied examples and instructional material, as well as building relationships for finding work after graduation.
An early fall welcome/orientation that includes students across all cohorts could be offered in order to build community, allow for student networking, and emphasize key point/changes in the program. A keynote talk focusing on a major skill such as interviewing, negotiation, team work, or time management might be an important draw for students. Such an orientation could also emphasize University resources such as: (1) the Institute for Healthcare Improvement Open School that offers monthly lectures by national experts in a Web-based learning format (the Utah chapter is sponsored by the CCTS Community Engagement Core); (2) Students could be encouraged to submit posters and/or attend the annual Utah Health Services Research meeting.

Another suggestion concerning communication of program structure is the Web page. At present the program seems to have inadequate resources to keep an up-to-date Web page that is interactive and informative for students.

5. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS—OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Currently, Program effectiveness is assessed through annual statistics on enrollment, graduation rates, retention, and gender and ethnicity. The quality of the Program can be gauged by several factors, including the success of graduates, satisfaction ratings by students, and judgment of academic peers. In each of these respects, the BS&H Program clearly warrants a favorable judgment.

Since the capstone course is the core of the Program and synthesizes material learned across the classes, the Program plans to add evaluative measures in 2010 to aid in curriculum planning. The feedback will be used to assess student response to the Program in general and to assess competencies in specific areas covered in the course (i.e. familiarity with health and healthcare related fields, knowledge of factors impacting health, integration of material, written and oral skills). Feedback from this assessment will be used to make changes to the curriculum, to develop the one-credit introductory course, and to inform changes to the website. It will be useful to combine this information with instruction evaluations in order to modify and improve course content, as well as course and Program navigation procedures such as mentoring for job placement, tracking students after graduation, etc.

**Student success.** Overall, the success rate of BS&H graduates is comparable to other majors at the University regarding entrance to graduate schools, other specialty programs and reasonably well-paying jobs. Evaluation of the GPA indicates that students in the BS&H Program are on par with most majors in the College. The GPA of students who take and complete the capstone course is above average.

Because a high number of enrolled students have double majors, it appears that this Program occupies a specific interdisciplinary niche in addition to what may be offered by the traditional format of majors such as Economics, Political Science or Psychology. 60% of pre-Nursing, pre-Pharmacy, and pre-Social Work majors declare BS&H as one of their double majors, indicating that it is viewed as a useful and important major by students who plan to matriculate in professional health services degree programs.
**Student satisfaction.** The only student rating information available for courses that are specifically part of the BS&H program concerns the capstone class. The TAs for that class have received very positive ratings, but the students seem to have little exposure to the Program co-directors who are listed as faculty for the capstone class and who are described in the self-study as “supervis[ing] and participat[ing] in the Capstone.” Because of the interdepartmental structure of the Program, faculty and graduate students from other departments teach most classes that make up the Program. Several of these core courses also receive high ratings from students. Some of the core courses are typically taught by regular faculty members associated with the Program (e.g. Sociology 3673: Social Epidemiology; and the medical anthropology courses), while others are regularly taught by a mix of regular faculty members and graduate students (e.g. Economics 5190: Economics of Health). As a result, it is possible that students in the major will seek letters of recommendation from graduate student instructors. Although the students did not perceive this as a problem, it is a potential Program weakness that might affect students in the future. It is notable that associate instructors are critical to the Program’s success and very highly regarded by students. Declining numbers of students declaring the major are of concern because if numbers fall too much further it may be difficult to maintain funding for the associate instructors as this funding is based on SCH generated by the capstone course.

As part of the internal review, six senior students were interviewed about their experience with the BS&H Program. All were highly enthusiastic about the education they had received. They were unreservedly positive about the quality of the faculty, the quality of the courses, and the quality of other students they had met in the major. All were engaged and well informed. They planned to seek or were in the process of seeking employment or preparing to apply for graduate school. In line with the interests relayed by the advisory board faculty, the students particularly liked the classes that involved applied analytical syntheses. Judging from these students, the Program is attracting first-rate majors and providing them a high quality education.

**Graduation:** Upon graduation about 60% of BS&H students get jobs, and 40% go on to graduate studies. Of the 78 students who received bachelor’s degrees from 2007-2009, nearly all were hired in a health related field; their average salary was the third highest among all College of Social and Behavioral Science majors. All who went to graduate school pursued a degree in a health-related field, which is a testament to the benefits of the Program.

6. FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

The facilities and resources for the BS&H program are sufficient for the current student body volume, the current structure of coursework, and current coursework load. However, as presently configured, the Program has limited resources and some attention to continued support will be necessary to maintain their current success. Competing programs within the Anthropology Department and outside may eventually cause the Program to dwindle. Minimal support requirements should be included in the strategic planning process.

The core operating budget provided by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences includes the part-time salaries for the co-directors, associate instructors, and the Program advisor, plus supplies. Salaries for additional instructors and BS&H activities are generated from student credit hours (productivity funds) in the capstone course and internships. Currently there are no
operating budget issues. However, if the Program creates another course, provides more in-depth student mentoring, grows in capacity, and/or works to increase minority representation, additional resources will be needed whether or not the student body volume increases.

Spaces for teaching and library access are adequate. However, the BS&H Program self-review reported that computer equipment, web revision and support, and computer services (maintenance, upgrades, etc.) require more financial support.

7. COMMENDATIONS

A. Broad Behavioral Science and Public Health Exposure
The BS&H program serves an important interdisciplinary need, especially for students with interests in health services. The program provides students broad exposure to behavioral science and public health. The interdisciplinary structure of the program means that students have access to courses in research methods and quantitative skills, epidemiology, biology, behavioral science, philosophy, economics, anthropology, administration and public policy. This broad undergraduate curriculum is especially beneficial for those who eventually select more narrowly focused professional degrees such as medicine, dentistry or health administration.

With health care representing 17% of the GNP, it is expected that there will be increased demand for undergraduate degrees that provide a broader foundation for graduation, education or early careers in health.

B. Course Flexibility
The design of the BS&H Program allows students to select from over 45 courses in about nine categories (such as choosing one course out of five offered in biological and environmental health). Students reported that they liked the opportunity to self-design their curriculum and to explore topics of interest in health care, public health, and health policy. The flexibility of the BS&H Program is a distinctive feature that should be marketed to prospective students.

C. Capstone Course
The co-directors of the BS&H Program developed a required capstone course about six years ago with the objectives to have students:

- Connect to practitioners in the field.
- Discuss contemporary public health issues
- Integrate various disciplines prior to degree completion

The capstone course has served as a final integrating experience similar to the function of senior seminar courses.

Due to the virtual, interdisciplinary nature of the BS&H program, it was a milestone to develop the capstone. The capstone course has been offered in a similar format for the past six years. Student evaluations have been conducted. Since one of the associate instructors is completing her doctoral work and assumed to be departing the BS&H program, now is a good time for the co-directors to rethink the format, the assignments and the evaluation methods of the capstone in order to assure that the original objectives are being met.
D. The Program has a strong, diverse and enthusiastic group of majors

E. The Program draws upon highly qualified faculty for advice and instruction

8. REMARKATIONS

The BS&H major appeals to students with a wide range of interests in health policy and healthcare and appears to serve these students well. Although we recommend strengthening the Program in some respects, this should not be understood as an overall criticism of its success. Rather, we would urge the College of Social and Behavioral Science and the University to work with the Program in strategic planning efforts to assure continued support at an appropriate level.

Advisory Board Co-Chairs Norm Waitzman and Polly Wiessner have submitted a response to the recommendations and these are listed with each recommendation. They write, “We are grateful for the time and effort that the reviewers put into making constructive criticisms. In response we propose to make the following changes. Many of the suggestions actually originated with us and incorporate plans that are already in the works. These will be designated below with “in progress”. Years are designated to indicate when other plans will be instituted.”

A. Enhance the Advising Function
The flexibility and virtual nature of the BS&H program means that students have academic advising needs that are greater than students would have in a more structured department-based degree. The current advisor does a commendable job of meeting the academic needs of the students. In addition the career advising function is perceived by faculty and staff to be ably carried out by the University Career Center. However, students did not report having used the University Career Center at all. Despite the fact that all the students interviewed were graduating and had career questions, none of them had taken the initiative to call the Career Center, and they were unaware of any of the services provided. There is a disconnect between the Program leadership’s perception of career advising effectiveness and the students’ perception. This gap can be bridged through a BS&H orientation course, through information on the Website, through email, or though a seminar held at the beginning of the senior year to talk about career advising.

Response:
- Meet with pre-med advisors, the University’s college advisor and advisors at SLCC to refresh their knowledge of the program and its strengths (in progress).

B. Engage the Advisory Council in discussions about outcomes and/or a competency framework
Professional education at both the graduate and undergraduate level has gone through a transformation in recent years through the appreciation that faculty should be focused on both what students need to know and what they need to be able to do. Professional educational associations such as the American Association of Medical Colleges (AAMC), the Council on Linkages in Public Health, and the Society for Education in Public Health have all adopted competency models largely based on Bloom’s taxonomy which creates a framework for
indentifying the essential competencies of graduates moving the students from novice toward mastery. These frameworks recognize that the individual develops mastery of skills through practice and constant feedback and coaching and are based on models of lifelong learning beginning with formal undergraduate education and continuing through professional education.

The University of Utah recognizes this evolution and is asking programs, over the next few years, to identify the outcomes expected of their students. The Advisory Council should engage faculty in discussions of what they expect students to know and do and then audit courses to see if the curricula develop those competencies. The faculty need to reflect on whether their teaching methods provide an opportunity for those competencies to develop. The major teaching method is traditional lecturing; and students develop competencies by doing, not by hearing. Thus, for example, students need to practice conducting a community needs assessment and talking about what it means rather than just hearing a lecture.

Response:
- Outcomes and desired competencies and how to reach these will be discussed with the board (2010-11).
- Revisit the capstone discussion sections to make sure we are accomplishing goals for desired outcomes and competencies (in progress).
- Devise additional ways to test for achievement of competencies in the capstone (in progress).
- Continue to train TA replacement for Shelly Braun who received her PhD and will leave the program (in progress).
- Institute an evaluation survey at the end of the capstone (in progress).

C. Develop community engagement opportunities.
The BS&H program offers limited opportunities for students to engage in community health organizations or activities. Employed students elect not to do the optional since they have limited time to participate in unpaid internships even when the commitment is as little as 3 hours/week. Faculty can address this in several ways that are not mutually exclusive:
- Create a required introductory course that provides an overview of the BS&H curriculum and connects students to the community.
- Create a required “Community Outreach” course.
- Develop a means through the website to communicate with BS&H students about community engagement opportunities.

The introductory course could be used to accomplish three objectives: 1) provide an overview of the academic program; 2) introduce the concept of community engagement and introduce students to careers and resources to investigate; and 3) evaluate various careers in behavioral science and health.

The capstone course provides an opportunity for students to hear from leaders in the field, but again, these are lectures and the required abstracts do not challenge students to apply what they have learned from their courses. Rather, they are responsible for summarizing the speakers’ key points. Students reported that they would find more value in writing weekly papers that ask them to critically address a key question raised by the speaker (e.g., Do you agree that
accountable care organizations could reduce health care expenses?), synthesizing rather than
summarizing information from their other courses. Furthermore, the Capstone requires students
to write two papers that connect the content from two selected speakers. Since all of the students
seem to have work experience, one of the assignments in the Capstone course could be to
challenge the students to think about how their own work unit could connect to relevant
community organizations. This would allow them to apply principles of community engagement
to an organization they know well and could possibly lead to taking meaningful action at their
current jobs.

Response:
- Draw on board connections to develop relations with the community (in progress).
- Introduce a BS&H social event at the beginning of each fall semester (2010-11).
- We have tried to institute a SAC every year but with no volunteers or enthusiasts. We
  will push a SAC again this year (2010-11).

D. Engage in Strategic Planning, develop program evaluation methods and have more
genre Advisory Council Meetings
The BS&H program Advisory Council meets only once a year. Other than routine course
evaluations, there are no regular means of evaluating the effectiveness of the program by such
measures as student completion rates, job placement rates, student satisfaction with curriculum
or student experience. At least twice a year, the Advisory Council should be reflecting on
program effectiveness and revising the curriculum in accordance with their findings. This is
especially important given the University’s mandate for program faculty to identify outcomes.
While one of the co-directors has already fulfilled this mandate by writing outcomes, it was not
the University’s intent for a single faculty member to write the outcomes. This would be similar
to having one member writing the mission of the program without collaboration and discourse
from the rest of the faculty. Therefore, it is recommended that the BS&H Advisory Council
meet to develop and “own” the outcomes of the BS&H Program. This process will challenge
them to reflect on the courses being offered, teaching methods, evaluation methods and overall
program design.

Response:
- One or more new board members will be added to the board (2010-11).
- A student representative will be added to the board (2010-11).
- The board will meet twice a year (2010-11).

E. Improve the Website
The current program Website is strictly information about the BS&H program curriculum. It
provides no information about University resources, career paths, other students, etc. The site
could describe various careers and testimonials from graduates about the value of a broad
educational experience. The site could link prospective students to key professional sites such
as AAMC (American Academy of Medical Colleges), AADC (American Association of Dental
Consultants), SOPHE (Society for Public Health Education), or AUPHA (Association of
University Programs in Health Administration). The Website could be used to connect BS&H
students to each other. Even if there were just a list of BS&H students with a link to their email
addresses, it would provide a vehicle for social networking. Many programs today have
“facebooks” that allow students to design their own pages and provide as much or as little information as they want their colleagues to know.

Currently, the Website does not serve as a vehicle for attracting potential students, nor does it serve as a resource for current students except on the University of Utah curriculum. The BS&H program does attend job fairs to attract students, and so prospective students could be directed to the Website to learn more about the program. In short, with minimal investment the Website could both market the program and serve as a career resource for students.

Response:
- Create a more dynamic Website. Over the past years we have tried to make our Website interactive without a positive response from the students. Clearly we need a professional to assist with creating appealing options. This is the one area in which we will need additional funds (2010-11).

F. Improve internship and research experiences for students.

Response:
- Add a new required one-credit orientation course to:
  --Develop a cohort of BS&H students as they enter the program
  --Orient and integrate students
  --Give an overview of the program and desired outcomes
  --Help students navigate the curriculum (2010-11)
  --Develop community engagement connections
  --Encourage internships
  --Make students aware of University resources
  (in progress—to be presented to the Curriculum Committee in 2010-11)
- We will strengthen the program in analytical methods. During the discussion with the external reviewers the Board and program directors, Rebecca Utz suggested that she would like to develop a course in analytical methods for BS&H after her tenure review. This would be optimal. If this does not work out in 2010, we will look for other options (2011-12).
## FACULTY AND STAFF

### BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE & HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>CONTRACT</th>
<th>ADJUNCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Doctoral degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Master's degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty with Bachelor’s degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FULL-TIME</th>
<th>PART-TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial/Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Aides/Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Graduate Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STUDENTS

**NOTE:** Faculty FTE from the instructor of record for the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACAD YR</th>
<th>Student Annual FTE</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student FTE to Faculty FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ugrad  Grad  Prof  Ascc  Asst  Inst  Ajnt  Res  Lect  Ugrad  Grad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>6.5       -        1       -       -       -       -       -       -       6.5  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>7.7       -        1       -       -       -       -       -       -       7.7  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>8.1       -        1       -       -       -       -       -       -       8.1  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>9.9       -        1       -       -       -       -       -       -       9.9  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>9.5       -        1       -       -       -       -       -       -       9.5  -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACAD YR</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Degrees Conferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ugrad  Grad  Bach  Master  PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>134    -        66     -       -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>178    -        79     -       -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>168    -        87     -       -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>182    -        86     -       -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>205    -        111    -       -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Behavioral Science & Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Costs</td>
<td>34,921</td>
<td>36,383</td>
<td>53,927</td>
<td>59,022</td>
<td>52,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>17,493</td>
<td>10,179</td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td>3,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>41,731</td>
<td>53,876</td>
<td>64,106</td>
<td>61,953</td>
<td>55,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Appropriation</td>
<td>55,651</td>
<td>62,180</td>
<td>62,888</td>
<td>63,719</td>
<td>71,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reallocation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition to Programs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>55,651</td>
<td>62,180</td>
<td>62,888</td>
<td>63,719</td>
<td>71,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue-Expense</td>
<td>13,920</td>
<td>8,304</td>
<td>(1,217)</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>16,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum of Understanding
Behavioral Science and Health Program
Undergraduate Council Review

This memorandum of understanding is a summary of decisions reached at a wrap-up meeting on January 24, 2011 and concludes the Undergraduate Council Review of the Behavioral Science and Health Program. David W. Pershing, Senior Vice President for Academic affairs; John Francis, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; Steve Roens, Senior Associate Dean of the Office of Undergraduate Studies; M. David Rudd, Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science; Norman Waitzman, and Pauline Wiessner, Co-Directors of the Behavioral Science and Health Program, were present.

The discussion centered on, but was not limited to, recommendations included in the Undergraduate Council Review completed on November 30, 2010.

Recommendation 1. Advising Function

The Program has reviewed and thought through the internal advising situation and its dual role in both academic and career advising.

Recommendation 2. More Frequent Meetings of the Advisory Council

The Program will engage the Advisory Board in discussions about outcomes and community engagement opportunities. The Program is already having the Advisory Board meet more frequently.

Recommendation 3. Creation of a Required Introductory Course

The Program has already created a required introductory course.

Recommendation 4. Strategic Planning

The Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science will work with the Program to define clear long-term goals, including meeting the desired number of enrollments in the program and developing internship possibilities, given the limited infrastructure.

Recommendation 5. Improve the Web Site

There will be a webmaster for the college who will convert the different platforms the college uses to a single system. This will take at least two years. The Program will work to update its web platform to the same system the College will be using.

Recommendation 6. Internships

The College of Social and Behavioral Science will have an intern coordinator who will help develop internships to work in the community for the Program and who will also help create uniformity in internships across the College. The Program already has three new internships involved with health reform in the legislature.
This memorandum of understanding is to be followed by annual letters of progress from the Director of the Program to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Letter will be submitted each year until all of the actions in the preceding paragraphs have been addressed.

David W. Pershing  
Senior VP for Academic Affairs

M. David Rudd  
Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Science

Norman Waitzman  
Co-Director, Behavioral Science and Health

Pauline Weissner  
Co-Director, Behavioral Science and Health

John Franks  
Senior Associate VP for Academic Affairs