



APR 18 2018

Copy: _____

**Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges**

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE REAFFIRMATION COMMITTEE

Statement Regarding the Report

The Board of Trustees of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) is responsible for making the final determination on reaffirmation of accreditation based on the findings contained in this committee report, the institution's response to issues contained in the report, other assessments relevant to the review, and application of the Commission's policies and procedures. Final interpretation of the Principles of Accreditation and final action on the accreditation status of the institution rest with SACSCOC Board of Trustees.

Name of the Institution:	University of Texas at Dallas
Date of the Review:	March 6-8, 2018
SACSCOC Staff Member:	Dr. Crystal A. Baird
Chair of the Committee:	Dr. J. Alan Boyette Senior Vice Provost University of North Carolina – Greensboro Greensboro, NC

Part I. Overview and Introduction to the Institution

The Report of the Reaffirmation Committee is the final committee analysis and report that includes the findings of the Off- and On-Site Reaffirmation Committees. It will be forwarded to the institution for a formal response. The report and the institution's response are forwarded to the Commission's Board of Trustees for action on reaffirmation of accreditation.

The University of Texas at Dallas (UTD) is a relatively young institution. From its pre-university origin in 1961 as the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest (changing its name to the Southwest Center for Advanced Studies in 1967), it was added to the University of Texas System as the University of Texas at Dallas on June 13, 1969.

UT Dallas offered only graduate degrees until 1975, when the addition of juniors and seniors helped boost enrollment from 408 to 3,333 students. By the fall of 1977, enrollment had reached more than 5,300 students. During that pivotal period of growth, the science and technology focus of the institution expanded with the addition of several academic programs, centers, and institutes focused on health and human development, becoming a leader in providing advanced health screening and innovative treatments for children and adults with a wide variety of speech, language and hearing disorders.

The School of Management opened in 1975 and has since become the University's largest school, offering programs at the undergraduate, graduate and executive levels. The UT Dallas engineering school was established in 1986 as a result of the joint efforts of business, community and education leaders. The Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science is the second-largest school at the University, with about 2,700 students currently enrolled in its wide array of graduate and undergraduate programs.

In 1990, the University admitted its first freshman class of 100 students. Since then, freshman classes have grown while the University has maintained rigorous enrollment requirements. The transition from an upper-division school to a four-year university with an emphasis on engineering, mathematics, the sciences, and management has been accompanied by a sustained commitment to instruction, research, and service.

In 2016, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recognized The University of Texas at Dallas as a doctoral university performing the highest level of research activity. Today UT Dallas enrolls more than 27,600 students—18,380 undergraduate and 9,250 graduate—and offers a broad array of bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs.

In addition to the campus in Richardson, off-campus instructional sites are located in the cities of Dallas and McKinney. As part of the reaffirmation review, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee visited these two off-campus sites, where the institution offers instruction in several disciplines. Information about these sites is included in Appendix B.

Following a welcome and overview with UTD's leadership team, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee spent the first day in various executive sessions, in interviews with institutional officers responsible for specific functions under review, and in meetings with individuals who play key roles in the design and implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), including the QEP Leadership Team. The second day of the review was given to interviewing select administrative officers and a member of the governing board, conducting focused group discussions with QEP teams, lunch with students and faculty, and sharing preliminary findings with President Benson. The remainder of the day was spent in Executive Session, reaching consensus as to compliance with the Principles of Accreditation. The

following morning an oral exit report was delivered to the institution's President, other senior officers, the institutional SACSCOC liaison, and a select group of administrators involved in preparation of the Compliance Certification Report and Quality Enhancement Plan.

Throughout the time of the visit, the cooperation and courtesies extended to the Committee were very much appreciated and most helpful.

Part II. Assessment of Compliance

A. Assessment of Compliance with Section 1: The Principle of Integrity

1.1 The institution operates with integrity in all matters. (Integrity)

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found no evidence of a lack of integrity on the part of the institution.

After the Off-Site Committee's report had been submitted, the institution self-disclosed a serious matter pertaining to the inappropriate awarding of grades in its Executive Master of Science program in Justice Administration and Leadership. In short, this disclosure indicated that faculty members in the Justice Administration and Leadership (JAL) program were awarding "A" grades to students who were enrolled in JAL courses but who did not attend any of these class sessions or complete any course assignments. The grades were being awarded in recognition of the students' completion of non-credit courses from the Caruth Police Institute and the Institute for Law Enforcement Administration, entities that offer continuing education courses to law enforcement and corrections administrators. JAL program leadership had sought institutional permission to engage in such awarding of credit for non-credit coursework, but the institution denied this request. The program leadership made the explicit decision to engage in this practice, despite being forbidden from doing so, and despite the presence of an institutional policy indicating that UTD does not award academic credit for non-credit experiences. Details of this matter are described in President Benson's letter to President Wheelan dated January 4, 2018. In response to this letter, President Wheelan wrote to President Benson on January 9, 2018, indicating that the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee would be charged with reviewing this matter, including within its review Comprehensive Standard 10.8 (Evaluating and awarding academic credit) and Principle 1 (Integrity).

In advance of and during the committee's visit, the institution provided a substantial amount of information regarding the self-disclosure of its inappropriate awarding of grades. In addition, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with the President, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost, Dean of Graduate Studies, Assistant Provost (SACSCOC Liaison), University Registrar, Speaker of the Faculty, Vice Speaker of the Faculty, Secretary of the Faculty, and the Criminal Justice Faculty (including the Justice Administration and Leadership program faculty), among others, to explore this matter further.

One of the documents provided on February 24, 2018 to the chair of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee was a *Justice Administration and Leadership Update*. This document, dated for the Committee's February 26 conference call, contained a summary of events and planned actions by the institution. This information was also summarized in a March 1, 2018 letter from President Benson to President Wheelan,

which was shared with the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee. These documents confirmed that the institution's senior leadership acted swiftly upon learning about this matter. They met with and questioned relevant School and program administrators, faculty, and students, as well as administrators from the two police institutes, and immediately terminated all enrollment, marketing, and academic activity pertaining to this program while their investigation unfolded. The institution ultimately proposed corrective actions with regard to the operation of the program; including establishing procedures for awarding credit for non-credit experiences. The institution indicated that after working with students to address their immediate needs, it would be turning its attention to addressing the related personnel issues.

These steps, as well as the related actions taken by the institution during the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee's visit, confirm that the institution exhibits a high level of integrity. Institutional leadership acted in an open, honest, and collegial manner, providing unfettered access to relevant individuals and documentation. This free access extended to the JAL matter as well as all other aspects of the institution's compliance with all accreditation principles. Moreover, the materials provided to the On-Site Committee were generally complete, accurate, and current. It is the Committee's opinion that these factors provide evidence of the institution's integrity regarding all documentation and reporting of compliance with applicable standards and requirements.

B. Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements

- 2.1** The institution has degree-granting authority from the appropriate government agency or agencies. **(Degree-granting authority)**

The institution provided sufficient documentation through the Texas Education Code Title 3, Chapters 61, 65, and 70; State of Texas House Bill 303, and the University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations that UT Dallas has degree granting authority as authorized by the appropriate state agencies including the Texas Higher Education Commission Coordinating Board and the University of Texas System. Supporting documentation was presented regarding the formation of UT Dallas, that the UT Dallas Academic Senate certifies the degrees, and that the president confers them by authority of the Board of Regents.

- 2.2** The institution has a governing board of at least five members that is the legal body with specific authority over the institution. The board is an active policy-making body for the institution and is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are adequate to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting members of the board are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution.

A military institution authorized and operated by the federal government to award degrees has a public board on which both the presiding officer and a majority of the other members are neither civilian employees of the military nor active/retired military. The board has broad and significant influence upon the institution's programs and operations, plays an active role in policy-making, and ensures that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by

organizations or interests separate from the board except as specified by the authorizing legislation. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting board members are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution. **(Governing board)**

The institution has documented that it has an appropriate governing board, as evidenced by relevant sections of the Texas Government Code, Texas Education Code Section 65, University of Texas Regents' Rules and Regulations, and the University of Texas Ethics Standards. These documents indicate that the University Of Texas Board Of Regents is comprised of ten active members (nine plus one student) and that this body has policy-making responsibility with fiduciary control over the educational programs and finances of UT Dallas. The institution provided samples of the Board of Regents meeting minutes. The appointment process, staggered terms of service, and the transparency of meetings ensure the board is not controlled by a minority of board members. Conflict of interest and financial disclosure reporting by board members assure the presiding officers and the other board members are free of contractual, employment, and personal or family financial interest in the institution. Board of Regents meetings are archived on the web demonstrating the transparency of voting by regents in areas of potential conflict.

- 2.3** The institution has a chief executive officer whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who is not the presiding officer of the board. (See the Commission policy "Core Requirement 2.3: Documenting an Alternate Approach.") (Chief executive officer)

The institution's president is the chief executive officer of UT Dallas. According to the UT Dallas Overall Organizational Chart, the president has a direct reporting relationship to the UT System executive vice chancellor for academic affairs. The president's duties and responsibilities are documented by the institution in the University of Texas Regents' Rules and Regulations and the UT Dallas president's position specification. The Regents' Rules and Regulations stipulates the process for the appointment of the president. Documentation was provided that the selection of the current president was consistent with that process. The president's duties are clearly indicated as being presiding officer with oversight of institutional planning, policy, budget, personnel appointments, management of business affairs and physical property, and external affairs. The UT Dallas president is not a member of the Board of Regents, and there is a separate presiding officer of the board.

- 2.4** The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission statement that is specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The mission addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service. **(Institutional mission)**

The university has a clearly defined and comprehensive mission statement that is appropriate for higher education. The mission statement addresses teaching and learning and also specifically addresses research. It is specific to the institution and is published in official university documents (e.g. Catalog, etc.) and is also published with the institution's strategic plan. It is also communicated to all new employees through new employee orientation.

- 2.5** The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systemic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. **(Institutional effectiveness)**

Evidence provided by the institution demonstrates that the university engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide planning, and research-based planning and evaluation processes. The institution most recently developed a ten year strategic plan in 2007. The plan was subsequently updated in 2011 and 2013 in response to the "Tier One" legislation that required the university to submit a long term strategic plan to guide its development from an emerging research university to a "Tier One" university. The 2013 plan is clearly an update to the 2007 plan with direct ties to the six strategic initiatives and other imperatives. During its strategic planning process and subsequent updates, the institution reviewed its mission, goals, and outcomes and updated them as appropriate. Further, documentation (e.g., annual reports, assessment reports, etc.) demonstrates how the institutional effectiveness process resulted in improved institutional quality (e.g., the development of programs to decrease the achievement gap between white students and students of color).

- 2.6** The institution is in operation and has students enrolled in degree programs. **(Continuous operation)**

The institution has been in continuous operation since 1969, when it was established by the Texas state legislature as a graduate institution as part of the University of Texas System. UT Dallas was authorized in 1975 to enroll junior and senior undergraduate transfer students and to offer bachelor's degrees in the natural sciences and mathematics, arts and humanities, general studies, human development, management, and social sciences. In 1990, the institution was permitted to enroll freshmen and sophomores for the first time, but was restricted in both class size and program offerings until 2005.

Currently, the institution is authorized to offer bachelor's degrees in 51 different areas of study, master's degrees in 59 different areas of study, doctor of philosophy degrees in 30 different areas of study, and a professional doctorate in audiology for a total of 141 programs via eight schools: the School of Arts and Humanities; the School of Arts, Technology, and Emerging Communication; the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences; the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences; the Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science; the School of Interdisciplinary Studies; the Naveen Jindal School of Management; and the School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. These programs are listed in several documents supplied by the institution, including a "Degree Matrix," a "Program Inventory," and one entitled "Academic Programs," which appears on its website. According to a document provided by The Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis, the total enrollment for the fall 2016 semester was 17,350 undergraduate students and 9,443 graduate students for a total of 26,793 students. Current total enrollment exceeds 27,600.

- 2.7.1** The institution offers one or more degree programs based on at least 60 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the associate level; at least 120 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the baccalaureate level; or at least 30 semester credit hours or the

equivalent at the post-baccalaureate, graduate, or professional level. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification for all degrees that include fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit. **(Program length)**

The institution requires that all undergraduate degree programs have a minimum of 120 semester credit hours and all graduate level programs require at least 30 credits. All degree programs meet requirements set by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Degree requirements are published in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs and all programs, including semester credit hours are included in the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) Program Inventory.

The institution allows qualified undergraduate students to enroll in master's degree courses (limited to 15 semester credits) in the senior year. The dual-credit "fast track" option is available in programs spanning seven of the eight schools. The institution provided documentation from the 2007 Focused Report to justify the program.

At a minimum, students must meet a GPA minimum and complete core requirements for the undergraduate degree in order to be eligible for the fast-track dual-enrollment option. Selection into the dual-degree program is determined by faculty evaluation of student qualifications. Completed credit counts toward both undergraduate and graduate degrees and coursework appears on both undergraduate and graduate transcripts. In all fast-track programs, up to 15 credit hours of graduate coursework in the major may count as both as undergraduate and graduate coursework.

2.7.2 The institution offers degree programs that embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with its stated mission and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education. **(Program content)**

Academic programs are compatible with the institution's mission statement, which included "graduating well-rounded citizens whose education has prepared them for rewarding lives and productive careers."

The institution relies on the faculty to develop programs that meet the requirements of the System Board of Regents. The approval process for new programs requires approval from the school dean and either a graduate or undergraduate faculty council. Undergraduate proposals are reviewed by the Council for Undergraduate Education and then to the Committee on Educational Policy – which reviews the policies and procedures of the proposed programs and finally to the Academic Senate. Additionally, the approval process for new programs includes a description and justification of the program that meets the criteria outlined in the THECB's rules. The programs listed in the THECB are appropriate to the mission and for a higher education institution.

***2.7.3** In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the collegiate level that (1) is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree, (2) ensures breadth of knowledge, and (3) is based on a coherent rationale. For degree completion in associate programs, the component constitutes a minimum of 15 semester hours or the equivalent; for baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent. These credit hours are to be drawn from and include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural

science/mathematics. The courses do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification if it allows for fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit of general education courses. **(General education) New standard 9.3**

The institution requires that all students complete a general education core curriculum of 42 semester credit hours that serves as a broad foundation for the undergraduate degree. The institution uses standards set by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The credit hour course requirements for the general education component at the collegiate level specifically include at least one three hour credit course in each of the following academic disciplines: humanities and fine arts; social and behavioral sciences; and natural science and mathematics. The courses are not narrowly focused or skills based.

The requirement ensures a foundation of knowledge of human cultures and of the physical and natural world, develops principles of personal and social responsibility for living in a diverse world, and advances intellectual and practical skills that are essential for all learning.

The Core Curriculum Committee is responsible for the initial review and approval of core courses. Subsequently the Council for Undergraduate Education, the Committee on Educational Policy and the Academic Senate confer their approval and recommendations to the Provost and ultimately to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for final approval.

The core curriculum is published in the Undergraduate Catalog and the specific courses that fulfill the core curriculum requirement are published each semester in the online schedule of classes. Transferability is guaranteed for coursework completed at state institutions, and there is a process for evaluating completed coursework from private and out-of-state institutions.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the *Texas Administrative Code (THECB Rules)*, chapter 4, subchapter B, sections 4.28-4.31 and UT-Dallas's general education requirements in support of the institution's case for compliance. In addition, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee interviewed the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee and the Chair of the Council for Undergraduate Education, and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- 2.7.4** The institution provides instruction for all course work required for at least one degree program at each level at which it awards degrees. If the institution does not provide instruction for all such course work and (1) makes arrangements for some instruction to be provided by other accredited institutions or entities through contracts or consortia or (2) uses some other alternative approach to meeting this requirement, the alternative approach must be approved by the Commission on Colleges. In both cases, the institution demonstrates that it controls all aspects of its educational program. (*See the Commission policy "Core Requirement 2.7.4: Documenting an Alternate Approach."*) **(Course work for degrees)**

The institution provides all the coursework for at least one program at each level,

undergraduate and graduate (master's, Ph.D. and A.U.D.). Plans of study for all academic programs are published online in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs.

- *2.8** The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs.
(Faculty) New standard 6.1 and 6.2b

The institution determines full-time faculty needs based on adequate staffing for the overall student population. The institution reports a total of 849 full-time faculty in 2015-16 including 516 tenured/tenure-track and 333 non-tenure-track appointments. In addition, 353 part-time instructional staff, including graduate students, contribute to supporting the curriculum. The institution offers over 51 baccalaureate degree programs, 1 post-baccalaureate certificate program, 90 graduate degree programs, and 24 graduate certificate programs through coursework in 8 schools. The institution reports that full-time instructional faculty provided 85% of all sections taught in Fall 2016. A student: faculty ratio of 24:1 is reported, with an average class size for full-time faculty of 37.8 students for undergraduate course and 13 for graduate courses.

Faculty are expected to be effective teachers, as well as high-caliber scholars, researchers, and practitioners in the fields central to the University's mission. A full-time instructional load is defined as 18 undergraduate credit hours, equivalent to six undergraduate 3-credit hour courses. Faculty may receive significant course release for grant-funded research. No other accommodation for scholarship or graduate mentorship activities is described, nor is differential calculation of graduate teaching load described. Therefore, questions remained for the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee regarding the sufficiency of the number of full-time faculty given research expectations.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the numbers of full-time and part-time faculty along with teaching assignments, average class size, and student: faculty ratio. The committee reviewed UT Dallas' Policy on Minimum Faculty Academic Workload Requirement, UTDPP1060, which explains faculty teaching requirements and equivalencies for graduate classes, large classes, buy-out policy from funded research, administrative assignments, supervision of labs, student teachers, interns, practicums and graduate research. Review of the UT Dallas teaching load listing for fall 2017 shows the report prepared for all faculty and their teaching load for that semester. Two redacted appointment letters provided examples of course release for new faculty to help them establish their scholarly and creative work. These policies and data demonstrate that the institution employs an adequate number of full-time faculty to support the mission and goals of UT Dallas.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee also reviewed the University's strategic plan from 2007, updates in 2010 and 2013 as well as draft work on the next plan. These plans express an ambition to grow the faculty size to keep pace with enrollment growth and to expand the research mission of UT Dallas. Faculty growth to match enrollment growth will be necessary to maintain an adequate number of full-time faculty and, of course, to grow the research mission.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the provided document, "The University of Texas at Dallas, Authorized and Active Degree Programs – AY 2016-2017," which includes lists of "Faculty Assignments" for both full-time and part-time faculty at the undergraduate, masters and PhD levels. During the on-site visit, members of the On-Site

Reaffirmation Committee met with the Provost, Assistant Provost, Executive Director, and the Associate Director, Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis to discuss faculty assignments within each degree program, criteria for an adequate number of qualified faculty, and how enrollment changes affect faculty assignment needs. This document and these conversations assured the committee that full and part-time faculty assignments to each degree program are sufficient for the array of program needs, including teaching, student advising, and curriculum review and innovation.

- 2.9** The institution, through ownership or formal arrangements or agreements, provides and supports student and faculty access and user privileges to adequate library collections and services and to other learning/information resources consistent with the degrees offered. Collections, resources, and services are sufficient to support all its educational, research, and public service programs. **(Learning resources and services)**

The institution provides students and faculty access to collections, services and other learning resources that sufficiently support its educational, research, and public service program offerings. Library collections consist of 3,155,007 items including print and electronic books, periodicals, maps, media, movies, music, primary sources, data sets, and electronic databases. In 2014, the institution began collecting textbooks used in core curriculum courses. Ejournal holdings have grown from 27,418 in 2006 to over 97,799 in 2016. The institution is a member of the Texas Digital Library and Texas State Library's TexShare Program. Participation in these consortia enhances student and faculty access to collections and services, as well as increases Library buying power. The institution has a current collection development policy and an approval plan. Library Liaisons, assigned to each college, work closely with faculty on aligning the curriculum with library collections. A Library Committee, composed of campus faculty and students, reviews collections and services. The Library is an active participant in the creation of new degree programs. The Library is open 24/7 for study Monday to Thursday and has substantial staffed hours Friday through Sunday. The Library makes available computers for student use, group study rooms, individual study room, and the building is outfitted with Wi-Fi. Library services include circulation, research and consultation services, information services, interlibrary loan, course reserves, and numerous online finding aids and tools available via the institution's web site. The institution uses a variety of means to assess collections, services, and facilities utilizing LibQual, Journal Citation Reports, and WorldShare Collection Evaluation. These services allow for peer library comparison of collections, expenditures, personnel and services to other libraries. The institution's LibQual results from 2015 indicate some small dissatisfaction with collections, with faculty being the most satisfied. The institution has robust and well-supported services for distance and off-site students.

The institution also supports a Student Success Center, which includes financial success programs, a communication lab, a math lab, supplemental instruction, peer-led learning, peer tutoring, academic success coaching, a writing center, and a testing center. Academic Computing supports two open computer labs and the Help Desk.

- *2.10** The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission that are intended to promote student learning and enhance the development of its students. **(Student support services) New standard 12.1**

Student support services and programs are wide ranging and comprehensive; appropriately linked to the institutional mission. Detailed evidence of these support

services is presented in the documentation. Consideration is given to distance learning students and other special populations. These services are evaluated in a variety of formats, including campus-wide surveys, directed surveys, and focus groups. Units are required to complete annual assessment reports that include operational outcomes and opportunities for improvement. A comprehensive division self-study is undertaken every five years, all detailed in principle CS 3.9.3. Student services include: career services, ID center, DOS, standards and conduct, Greek life, housing, intercollegiate athletic student support, international student support, learning communities, veteran's services, orientation programs, recreational sports, resident life, student government, accommodations, counseling, student health, media, student organizations, student union, transferring student services, volunteerism, wellness, and distance education support.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the university mission statement, UT Dallas Strategic Plan, 2017 Undergraduate Catalog, 2017 Graduate Catalog, relevant online information available on Student Affairs' webpages, and conducted interviews with Vice President for Student Affairs, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, Director of Assessment for Student Affairs, and students in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

2.11.1 The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services.

The member institution provides the following financial statements: (1) an institutional audit (or *Standard Review Report* issued in accordance with *Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services* issued by the AICPA for those institutions audited as part of a system wide or statewide audit) and written institutional management letter for the most recent fiscal year prepared by an independent certified public accountant and/or an appropriate governmental auditing agency employing the appropriate audit (or *Standard Review Report*) guide; (2) a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt, which represents the change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for the most recent year; and (3) an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning, is subject to sound fiscal procedures, and is approved by the governing board. **(Financial resources and stability) New standards 13.1 and 13.2**

At the time of the Off-Site Review, the institution was unable to provide the required institutional audit for fiscal year ended 2017. The university indicated that the audit would be provided as soon as the audit was complete, which is anticipated to be January 2018.

Based on the information provided to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee for the previous five year period, the institution appeared to be in a sound and stable financial position. Revenues had grown by 51% from 2012 to 2016. Net position had increased \$22.5 million during this period and the institution maintained its investment in capital assets. A sound budget for fiscal year 2017 was also provided.

Financial Resources, New standard 13.1

During the on-site visit, the Committee had a chance to review additional documentation pertaining to the institution's financial resources. At the end of each fiscal year, the university prepares the Annual Financial Report in conformity with generally accepted

accounting principles and in accordance with GASB and the University of Texas System Policy, UTS142.1, regarding the Annual Financial Report (AFR). The financial operations of UT Dallas are consolidated with other members of the University of Texas System system-wide AFR. The system-wide AFR is then consolidated with the State of Texas Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

The financial statements of the University of Texas at Dallas for the year ended August 31, 2017 were reviewed by Deloitte and Touche LLP, in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services promulgated by the Accounting and Review Services of the Committee of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed many financial documents provided by the institution including: internal audits, control reports, budget planning documents, approved operating budgets, consolidated annual financial reports, investment reports, statements of financial position, tuition and fees, board minutes, strategic plan and supporting documents, legislative appropriation requests, and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board materials.

During the on-site visit, the Committee discussed a wide variety of financial issues with the institution's Finance team. The committee met with the Executive Vice President, Vice President for Budget and Finance, Associate Vice President and Controller and the Director of Financial Aid.

	FY 17	FY 16	FY 15	FY 14	FY 13	5 year % Change
Total Assets	\$ 2,005,923,273	\$ 1,878,041,113	\$ 1,689,117,273	\$ 1,630,704,000	\$ 1,395,668,129	43.72%
Total Liabilities and Deferred Inflows	\$ 318,876,206	\$ 203,160,702	\$ 195,827,059	\$ 193,966,824	\$ 163,252,413	95.33%
Total Net Position	\$ 1,687,047,067	\$ 1,674,880,411	\$ 1,493,290,213	\$ 1,436,737,175	\$ 1,232,415,714	36.89%
Operating Revenues	\$ 428,761,979	\$ 397,900,993	\$ 371,689,118	\$ 318,222,818	\$ 294,103,643	45.79%
Total Operating Expense	\$ 612,583,000	\$ 571,692,440	\$ 531,527,014	\$ 491,372,594	\$ 441,395,784	38.78%
Net Nonoperating Revenues	\$ 220,098,945	\$ 208,052,057	\$ 141,095,034	\$ 209,497,110	\$ 160,240,506	37.36%
Ending Net Position	\$ 1,687,047,067	\$ 1,674,880,411	\$ 1,493,290,213	\$ 1,436,737,175	\$ 1,232,415,714	36.89%
Cash and Cash Equivalents	\$ 105,246,593	\$ 78,769,547	\$ 98,321,542	\$ 103,646,855	\$ 92,540,275	13.73%
Total Endowment	\$ 482,908,633	\$ 436,119,757	\$ 392,701,904	\$ 387,384,127	\$ 317,671,696	52.02%

The committee noted the following:

- Tuition and fees have been making up a larger proportion (43%) of the university's revenues,
- Enrollment growth has continued to climb—over 30% in the past five years,
- State appropriations have increased modestly—over 8% between FY 16 and FY 17,
- Robust growth in auxiliary enterprise funds, over 12% during the last fiscal year, and current restricted gifts and investment income, over 30% during the last fiscal year, and
- Enhanced diversification of the university's revenues.

Documentation and interviews provided by the University of Texas at Dallas confirms that the institution has a stable financial base to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services.

Financial Documents, New standard 13.2

During the on-site visit, the Committee had a chance to review the university's financial documents. The review encompassed a wide variety of documents (over 80) provided by the institution including: internal audits, control reports, budget planning documents, approved operating budgets, consolidated annual financial reports, investment reports, statements of financial position, tuition and fees, board minutes, strategic plan and supporting documents, legislative appropriation requests, and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board materials.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee discussed a wide variety of financial issues with the institution's Finance team. The committee met with the Executive Vice President, Vice President for Budget and Finance, Associate Vice President and Controller, and the Director of Financial Aid.

The committee noted the following:

- The financial statements of the University of Texas at Dallas for the year ended August 31, 2017 were reviewed by Deloitte and Touche LLP, in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services promulgated by the Accounting and Review Services of the Committee of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants,
- A statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt, which represents the change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for the 2017 fiscal year,
- A total net position increase of \$462,294,671 or 37.75% from 2013 to 2017,
- An unrestricted net position net of plant, OPEB, ACAP, and Pension of \$31,413,002 or 23.14% from 2013 to 2017,
- An operating budget of \$649,410,034, up over \$43 million or 7% from the previous fiscal year and a \$195 million or 43% increase over five years,
- Sound budget practices including the alignment of the investments in strategic areas of emphasis and programs of importance,
- Tuition and fees have been making up a larger proportion (43%) of the university's revenues,
- Enrollment growth has continued to climb—over 30% in the past five years,
- State appropriations have increased modestly—over 8% between FY 16 and FY 17,
- Robust growth in auxiliary enterprise funds, over 12% during the last fiscal year, and current restricted gifts and investment income, over 30% during the last fiscal year, and
- Enhanced diversification of the university's revenues

	FY 17	FY 16	FY 15	FY 14	FY 13	5 year % Change
Total Assets	\$ 2,005,923,273	\$ 1,878,041,113	\$ 1,689,117,273	\$ 1,630,704,000	\$ 1,395,668,129	43.72%
Total Liabilities and Deferred Inflows	\$ 318,876,206	\$ 203,160,702	\$ 195,827,059	\$ 193,966,824	\$ 163,252,413	95.33%
Total Net Position	\$ 1,687,047,067	\$ 1,674,880,411	\$ 1,493,290,213	\$ 1,436,737,175	\$ 1,232,415,714	36.89%
Operating Revenues	\$ 428,761,979	\$ 397,900,993	\$ 371,689,118	\$ 318,222,818	\$ 294,103,643	45.79%
Total Operating Expense	\$ 612,583,000	\$ 571,692,440	\$ 531,527,014	\$ 491,372,594	\$ 441,395,784	38.78%
Net Nonoperating Revenues	\$ 220,098,945	\$ 208,052,057	\$ 141,095,034	\$ 209,497,110	\$ 160,240,506	37.36%
Ending Net Position	\$ 1,687,047,067	\$ 1,674,880,411	\$ 1,493,290,213	\$ 1,436,737,175	\$ 1,232,415,714	36.89%
Cash and Cash Equivalents	\$ 105,246,593	\$ 78,769,547	\$ 98,321,542	\$ 103,646,855	\$ 92,540,275	13.73%
Total Endowment	\$ 482,908,633	\$ 436,119,757	\$ 392,701,904	\$ 387,384,127	\$ 317,671,696	52.02%

Documentation and interviews provided by the university confirms that the institution had an institutional audit, a statement of financial position, and an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning.

- 2.11.2** The institution has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. **(Physical resources)**

The institution has 152 facilities with 5.9 million gross square feet. UT Dallas provides 77 assignable square feet of academic and research space per FTE student. The university has demonstrated that it has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services through the THECB classroom utilization report, CBM005 Report, Facilities Management Survey, UT System BOR capital improvement plan, and Campus Master Plan. During 2012-16 UT Dallas added 2 million gross square feet.

- 2.12** The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. **(Quality Enhancement Plan)**

2.12 (1) New standard 7.2a

The institution has a topic identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes.

The institution developed an acceptable QEP. See Part III for additional information.

2.12 (2) New standard 7.2c

The institution has a QEP that (c) focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success. *(Quality Enhancement Plan)*

The institution developed an acceptable QEP. See Part III for additional information.

C. Assessment of Compliance with Section 3: Comprehensive Standards

- 3.1.1** The mission statement is current and comprehensive, accurately guides the institution's operations, is periodically reviewed and updated, is approved by the governing board, and is communicated to the institution's constituencies. **(Mission)**

UT Dallas' mission statement is current and comprehensive. The institution's strategic plan and operations are tied directly to its mission. The current mission statement was reaffirmed by the UT System Board of Regents in May of 2017. Further, the UT System Board of Regents requires institutions to review their mission statements every five years. The next review will occur in 2022; however, the institution is currently undergoing a strategic planning process, which includes a review and potential update of its mission statement.

- 3.2.1** The governing board of the institution is responsible for the selection and the periodic evaluation of the chief executive officer. **(CEO evaluation/selection)**

Both the selection and evaluation of the chief executive officer (president) of the institution are defined responsibilities of the University Of Texas Board Of Regents and by extension, the chancellor, deputy chancellor, and the executive vice chancellor for academic affairs of the University of Texas System. Key documents certifying those responsibilities include Texas Education Code Title 3 and Regents' Rules and Regulations. The president is selected through an Advisory Committee that has broad representation within and outside the UT System, and recommends candidates to the Board of Regents. Annual evaluation of the president occurs by the executive vice chancellor for academic affairs of the UT System following a systematic process of work plan development and a self-evaluation of accomplishments. The recent appointment of the president in 2016 did not allow for a sufficient cycle to complete the full presidential written evaluation but all other elements were documented, including a summary of institutional benchmarks.

3.2.2 The legal authority and operating control of the institution are clearly defined for the following areas within the institution's governance structure: (Governing board control)

3.2.2.1 The institution's mission

Numerous chapters and sections of the Texas Education Code stipulate that the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the University Of Texas Board Of Regents shall have authority to require and approve a mission statement for UT Dallas. Documentation provided by the institution indicates an approved mission statement developed by its administration and endorsed by the faculty effective November 2011 and then in May 2017. The executive vice chancellor of the University of Texas System requires that the mission statement be reviewed every five years.

3.2.2.2 The fiscal stability of the institution

The Texas Education Code, Texas Administrative Code, and Regents' Rules and Regulations collectively vest the state of Texas comptroller, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and the University of Texas System executive vice chancellor for business affairs with establishing the necessary internal and external controls to ensure that University of Texas funds are expended and recorded appropriately. The Regents' Rules and Regulations policies state that the president of UT Dallas has general authority for fiscal administration of the institution in concert with the executive vice chancellor for business affairs, and with generating an annual budget for approval by the appropriate executive vice chancellors, the chancellor, and the Board of Regents. The UT Dallas' Handbook of Operating Procedures Manual details the institution specific process. University of Texas System and institution specific audit functions further assure compliance with established best practices

3.2.2.3 Institutional policy

Numerous provisions of the Texas Education Code authorize the University Of Texas System Board Of Regents to oversee policy direction for each

institution under its purview. The Regents' Rules and Regulations is the official repository of the University of Texas System policies and procedures passed by the Board of Regents and extends authority for institution specific policy to the president. The UT Dallas' Handbook of Operating Procedures details policies, regulations and procedures specific to that institution and subject to overarching authority of the Regents' Rules and Regulations. All relevant policies are also published on the institution's Policy Navigator.

3.2.3 The governing board has a policy addressing conflict of interest for its members.
(Board conflict of interest)

The University of Texas Board of Regents are state officers and subject to state statutes of the Texas Government Code and Regents' Rules and Regulations pertaining to conflict of interest, financial disclosure, standards of conduct and qualification of business entities. The Texas Ethics Commission has published a Guide to Ethics Laws for State Officers and Employers. The UT Dallas provided supporting documentation of Board of Regent meetings demonstrating transparency to meet conflict of interest regulations.

3.2.4 The governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious, or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence. **(External influence)**

Numerous measures are in place to ensure the governing board is free from undue external influence. Provisions in the Texas Government Code 572, Texas Higher Education Code Title 3, and the Regents' Rules and Regulation pertaining to standards of conduct, state agency ethics, compensation, financial disclosure, and transparency preserve the appropriate institutional independence. As dictated by the Texas Education Code, the Board of Regents protects the institution from external influence by established policies on conflict of interest, conflict of commitment, and standards of conduct. The staggered terms of Board of Regents members and state statutes pertaining to open meetings and transparency facilitate this assurance of protection.

3.2.5 The governing board has a policy whereby members can be dismissed only for appropriate reasons and by a fair process. **(Board dismissal) New standard 4.2.e**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the *Texas Education Code* requires implementation of an involved and established review process prior to the dismissal of any state officer, including Regents of The University of Texas System. Furthermore, the Off-Site Committee found that the fair process for dismissal by impeachment is described in Article 15 of the Texas State Constitution. Despite the documented existence of appropriate and fair processes for board member dismissal, the Off-Site Committee indicated that the institution failed to provide evidence of implementation of the policy or a statement that there had been no need to implement the policy.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed additional materials provided in the Focused Report and interviewed (via telephone conference) a member of the UT Board of Regents to verify that there is an appropriate and fair process in the State of Texas for the dismissal of a board member. The institution has documented the procedures by which a board member would be removed under the *Texas Government Code Chapter 665: Impeachment and Removal*, which allows for removal only for cause, and/or the *Texas Constitution Article 15 – Impeachment*. While no board member has been dismissed

within the decennial review period, the *Investigative Report to the House Select Committee on Transparency in State Agency Operations regarding Conduct by University of Texas Regent Wallace Hall and Impeachment Under the June 25, 2013 Proclamation* provided evidence that the State of Texas follows the investigative procedures and other processes required for appropriate and fair dismissal of a board member. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined evidence provided by the institution, including the 173-page impeachment investigation report, and confirmed that the institution's governing board has appropriate and fair processes for board member dismissal.

- 3.2.6** There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy. **(Board/administration distinction)**

The Texas Education Code, Section 51 defines the policy-making function of the University Of Texas System Board Of Regents. Key provisions of the Regents' Rules and Regulations collectively articulate the policy making function of the Board of Regents, and the administration and implementation responsibilities of the University of Texas System chancellor and the UT Dallas president. The Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations also assign educational policy oversight to the respective institution's faculty. Other provisions address faculty rights and responsibilities pertaining to research and service, and faculty engagement in the governance of their institutions. The institution specific role of faculty in university governance and administrative policies are clearly indicated through the UT Dallas Handbook of Operating Procedures. Transparency of relevant policies occurs through university administrative and Academic Senate websites.

- 3.2.7** The institution has a clearly defined and published organizational structure that delineates responsibility for the administration of policies. **(Organizational structure)**

The University of Texas System Regents' Rules and Regulations policies demonstrate that the Board of Regents delegates general authority for the administration of UT Dallas to its president with oversight by the chancellor and the appropriate executive vice chancellor. The institution's general organizational structure and subunits (e.g. academic, faculty governance, finance, diversity, development, public affairs, communications) are published online and available to the public. The scope of responsibilities of the president, provost, vice presidents and deans, among other administrative roles, are articulated in the relevant UT Dallas websites. The institution also provided multiple examples of the responsibilities of key university committees, offices, and officers functioning to implement university and institution specific policies.

- *3.2.8** The institution has qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience and competence to lead the institution. **(Qualified administrative/academic officers)**
New standard 5.4

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed vitas and summaries of the 26 administrative officers (chancellor, vice chancellor, president, executive vice president, interim provost, 8 vice presidents, 1 interim vice president, 6 academic deans, 2 interim academic deans, and 4 administrative deans) and found that the institution employs officers with the administrative and academic competence to lead the University of Texas at Dallas. Comprehensive organizational charts were provided, along with position descriptions and statements of educational qualifications. Evidence of appropriate

recruitment and selection procedures for administrative and academic officers were outlined in the University of Texas System Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents. The institution has demonstrated a commitment to providing an environment that is welcoming, respectful and inclusive, prohibiting unlawful discrimination against a person because of their race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy), sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, disability, genetic information, or veteran status. Sample search material is provided for open executive level positions.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with the President, Executive Vice President, Provost and Associate Vice President of HR to discuss evaluation of administrative and academic officers. Conversation confirmed that all administrative and academic officers are evaluated annually with written feedback provided. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee's findings.

3.2.9 The institution publishes policies regarding appointment, employment, and evaluation of all personnel. **(Personnel appointment) New standard 5.5**

The institution publishes the conditions of employment, faculty credentials, and periodic performance evaluations in its Handbook of Operating Procedures Policy Navigator, which is available on the web. These policies apply to faculty, classified staff, and administrative and professional staff. The policies are adopted and approved by the President. Policy specifies that all faculty and staff will be evaluated on an annual basis. However, documentation was not provided for the consideration of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee to demonstrate that employment and evaluation practices are being performed in accordance with published policies.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the institution's Focused Response Report, in which, UT Dallas provided documentation, including sample hiring packets, e-mails notifying supervisors and employees of the annual evaluation process, sample annual reviews, and the annual report of its Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance to demonstrate that it is performing its employment and evaluation practices in accordance with published policy. This conclusion was supported through interviews with the institution's President, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and the Associate Vice President for Human Resources. These interviews also supported compliance with the evaluation of administrators in the following principle.

3.2.10 The institution periodically evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators. **(Administrative staff evaluations)**

The institution, as outlined in the University of Texas System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations, requires annual evaluation of all employees (faculty and staff; including vice presidents and deans). Additionally, all academic administrators below the level of president undergo periodic (every three to six years) evaluations that include input from faculty, staff, students and external constituents when appropriate. Redacted sample annual administrator evaluations were provided. Performance Appraisal Guidelines and Policies were provided as well. The criteria used for evaluating administrators was found to be appropriate.

3.2.11 The institution's chief executive officer has ultimate responsibility for, and exercises appropriate administrative and fiscal control over, the institution's intercollegiate athletics

program. **(Control of intercollegiate athletics)**

The UT Dallas president has codified oversight of the institution's athletic program through provisions of the UT System Board of Regents' Rules and Regulations, specifically those focused on administrative and fiscal control. As a member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Division III American Southwest Conference, UT Dallas must comply with regulations requiring the president to be responsible for administration of all aspects of the athletics program. Five-year NCAA reviews are conducted for compliance with those operating principles. The president has delegated authority to the vice president for student affairs, who reports to the president, and who in turn appoints a director of athletics. An Athletic Advisory Board advises the president. The fiscal oversight of the athletic program, including fundraising, is conducted through codified budgeting processes with appropriate reporting. Key offices engaged in ongoing review include the Office of Internal Audit and the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance.

- 3.2.12** The institution demonstrates that its chief executive officer controls the institution's fund-raising activities. **(Fund-raising activities)**.

The University of Texas System Regents' Rules and Regulations authorizes the UT Dallas president with active leadership in fundraising and development. The president delegates fund raising coordination to a vice president for development and alumni relations who reports to the president. The president and vice president coordinate a University Development Board. Institutional administrative policies pertaining to fundraising and development are specified in the UT Dallas' Handbook of Operating Policies and the UT Dallas Gift Acceptance Procedures. Such policies are subject to Board of Regents' overarching policies. A 2017-2021 Scope of Work having nine strategic themes articulated by the president forms the basis for a new five-year strategic plan that is also linked to UT System priorities. The institution described numerous administrative initiatives to implement the president's strategic themes.

- 3.2.13** For any entity organized separately from the institution and formed primarily for the purpose of supporting the institution or its programs: (1) the legal authority and operating control of the institution is clearly defined with respect to that entity; (2) the relationship of that entity to the institution and the extent of any liability arising out of that relationship is clearly described in a formal, written manner; and (3) the institution demonstrates that (a) the chief executive officer controls any fund-raising activities of that entity or (b) the fund-raising activities of that entity are defined in a formal, written manner which assures that those activities further the mission of the institution. **(Institution-related entities)**

The institution's Callier Center for Communication Disorders is supported by the Callier Foundation. The bylaws of the Callier Foundation describe its mission to support the university, its governance structure including two board members selected by the university president, and the lack of liability assumed by the institution due to its affiliation with the foundation. The university was previously supported by the Utley Foundation, Inc.; however, that entity, as of 2016, is no longer affiliated and no longer recognized as a nonprofit by the IRS.

- 3.2.14** The institution's policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of all intellectual property. These policies apply to students, faculty, and staff. **(Intellectual property rights)**

The institution adheres to the University of Texas System policies, specifically, Rule 90101 Intellectual Property of the University of Texas System Board of Regents and applies the policy to all faculty, staff and students. Information is publically available online, in the Researcher's Guide, and in the Handbook of Operating Procedures. Ownership of Intellectual Property (IP) under various conditions and disclosure requirements are provided in the policy. This policy clearly delineates ownership of IP under various conditions. Evidence of IP policy implementation was provided in the narrative (committee meeting minutes).

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas (**Institutional Effectiveness**)

***3.3.1.1** Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
New standard 8.2.a

Assessment reports for the 2015-16 assessment cycle reviewed by the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee demonstrate that the institution's educational programs identify expected outcomes, assess those outcomes, and make improvements based on the analysis of results. While many programs are making changes to their assessments and assessment practices, there is clear effort to make improvements to student learning based on the analysis of assessment results.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed additional evidence provided by the institution, including 2016-2017 assessment reports. Assessment reports contained feedback from the UTD Assessment Office. A review of a sample of the assessment reports indicate that some programs provide vague statements of expected student learning outcomes and appear to focus on course-level outcomes rather than program-level outcomes, such as BS Electrical Engineering and MAT Math Education. However, most reports have identified student learning outcomes that appear to be appropriate and sufficiently specific.

Academic programs are expected to use at least one direct measure of assessing each student learning outcome. The assessment reports demonstrated that programs typically use more than one measure of assessment for each student learning outcome and employ a variety of course-embedded assessments. Examples include rubrics (Art, PhD Political Science), exam scores (BA Math), average scores (graduate certificate in Business Intelligence and Data Mining), or grades on papers or projects. A review of the 2016-2017 assessment reports from BS Child Learning and Development, BS Electrical Engineering, and BS Healthcare Studies revealed varying levels of detail in describing assessment measures. Some measures were not described thoroughly and did not clearly indicate the data that were collected. The MA History program included use of indirect measures, such as doctoral program status of its graduates. The assessment report of the BS Child Learning and Development program indicated that the program faculty planned to disaggregate its assessment data in the future. The BS Business Administration assessment plan demonstrated that the program is using assessment data to make changes to its curriculum, teaching, and assessment measures.

The institution has a systematic annual process in which the Office of Assessment

expects each academic program to identify learning outcomes, assess the extent to which they are achieved, and use the results to seek improvements. The institution has created a new University Assessment Committee, charged from the Academic Senate, to communicate across units, between divisions, and with students; to bring together assessment representatives; and to promote and celebrate assessment efforts. After a review of evidence and interviews with the Director of Assessment, the Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination, the University Assessment Committee Chair, and the Assistant Dean of Assessment of the School of Arts and Humanities, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

3.3.1.2 Administrative support services (New standard 7.3)

Assessment plans for administrative support services units from 2015- 2016 and 2016-2017 were reviewed by the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee. These plans provide evidence that the institution identifies expected outcomes and assessments. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found no evidence of improvement based on the analysis of results. Most often, this was because the evidence was found in the 2016-2017 assessment report and referred to improvements that were to be made in the 2017-2018 year. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee indicated that tracking the improvements in the next year would help in documenting that planned improvements have occurred. The Off-Site Committee further stated that there were few examples of improvements made based on data in the 2015-2016 assessment reports, and it was unclear in those cases when improvements were identified, whether they were based on the analysis of assessment data.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed evidence provided by the institution in its Focused Report, including updated assessment reports for several units, as well as 2015 and 2016 Assessment Reports. It should be noted that 2017 Assessment Reports provided the expected outcomes, measure, and target, but did not yet include assessment results.

While the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that it was not clear if identified improvements were based on the analysis of assessment data, the 2018 Principles of Accreditation no longer contain language regarding improvements. The new standard 7.3 focuses on the identification of expected outcomes and evidence of measuring the extent to which the outcomes are achieved. After a review of 2015 and 2016 Assessment Reports and interviews with the Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordinator, the Director of Assessment, and the Assistant Director of Assessment, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee finds that the institution provided evidence that its administrative units identify expected outcomes and assess outcome achievement on an annual basis.

3.3.1.3 Academic and student support services

Assessment reporting for academic and student support services provides clear evidence that the institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results. Reports included all units of Student Affairs, the Office of Undergraduate Education, and the Office of Graduate Studies.

3.3.1.4 Research within its mission, if appropriate

The institution identifies that research is part of its mission and details a broad and expansive research enterprise that includes a number of university departments, committees, student research initiatives, and all graduate programs. Further, the institution includes research goals in its strategic plan and its plan to become a research one university through the Texas legislatures National University Research Fund program. In addition, at the institutional level, the institution provides four examples of improvements as a result of analysis of data in the Office of Sponsored Projects and the Office of the Provost accountability reports published by the Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis. Thus, the institution provides evidence that it sets expected outcomes related to research, documents its research activities, and tracks progress on research objectives.

3.3.1.5 Community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

In its narrative, the institution documents that it meets its community/public service mission by identifying the various clinical and non-clinical units with primary objectives for public outreach and coordinating volunteerism and service-learning. Community/Public Service outcomes are identified in its strategic plan and within the goals and/or plans of individual units on campus. However, the only indication of assessment of community/public service outcomes is found in the annual report of the Office of Student Volunteerism where the Office documented improvements in leadership development for students in the Student Leadership Program. This Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that one instance did not sufficient to document that the institution assesses community/public service outcomes and uses assessment results to inform improvements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that this standard has no correlating standard in the newly adopted 2018 edition of the Principles of Accreditation; therefore, it is no longer applicable.

3.3.2 The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (Quality Enhancement Plan)

The institution satisfactorily addressed component 3.3.2 (2) of this standard but did not provide evidence of compliance with components 3.3.2 (1) (New Standard 7.2d) and 3.3.2 (3) (New Standard 7.2e)

Recommendation 1: The Committee recommends the institution develop a Quality Enhancement Plan that commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP and includes a plan to assess achievement.

See Part III for additional information.

- 3.4.1** The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. **(Academic program approval)**

The institutional process for approving educational programs is initiated by departments and proceeds through a process that includes approval by the dean and provost, followed by review at the level of Academic Senate. Graduate, undergraduate and core curricular programs are reviewed by separate bodies of the Senate, and the process is aligned with THECB requirements. Each academic division or college includes a description of the process in its bylaws. Documentation of Senate activity was included as evidence of the process.

- 3.4.2** The institution's continuing education, outreach, and service programs are consistent with the institution's mission. **(Continuing education/service programs)**

The institution's continuing education programming is governed by policy (UTDPP1040 Continuing and Extended Activities), which defines continuing education course work as noncredit and extended education as for credit and self-supporting. The goals of continuing and extended education as stated in policy are in support of the institution's mission. Continuing education courses and service programs are typically offered through the schools or programs. Examples of campus level service activities were also provided.

- *3.4.3** The institution publishes admissions policies that are consistent with its Mission. **(Admissions policies) New standard 10.5**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that undergraduate and graduate admissions policies are consistent with the institution's mission. Admission to university is open to all candidates on the basis of academic preparation, ability, and availability of space without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, gender, age, disability, citizenship, veteran status, or sexual orientation. The criteria used in selecting students for admission varies as a function of the individual's classification and whether the applicant is seeking acceptance into an undergraduate or graduate program. Application requirements vary by academic program. Admission standards are published and made publicly available in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs. Samples are provided in the support documentation. The Office of Admission and Enrollment also includes admission standards on its webpages, including; undergraduate admission, undergraduate transfer admission, graduate admission, and admission for professional and executive education. The University Of Texas System Board Of Regents approves initial and subsequent revisions to admissions standards via the consent calendar after approval by the University of Texas System Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the UT System Board of Regents *Rules and Regulations* Rule 40303, Chapter 51 of the *Texas Education Code (TEC)*, the University catalogs, and the website of the Office of Admission and Enrollment, which includes admission standards on its webpages. Interviews were conducted with the Dean of the Graduate School, Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management, Director of Freshman Admission and Enrollment, Director of Transfer Admissions, and Director of Enrollment Technology in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirm the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- 3.4.4** The institution publishes policies that include criteria for evaluating, awarding, and accepting

credit for transfer, experiential learning, credit by examination, advanced placement, and professional certificates that is consistent with its mission and ensures that course work and learning outcomes are at the collegiate level and comparable to the institution's own degree programs. The institution assumes responsibility for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution's transcript. (See *Commission policy "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures."*) **(Acceptance of academic credit) New standard 10.8 (in combination with CS 3.4.8)**

The institution has policies for the evaluation, awarding, and transcription of credit from other accredited colleges and universities as well as credit by examination, such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and College-Level Examination Program. No credit is awarded for experiential learning. These policies are published in the online undergraduate and graduate catalogs.

For undergraduate programs, the Office of the Registrar evaluates the student's record for transferable credit. A faculty advisor in the student's major in consultation with the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education approves all transfer credit. For graduate programs, the request for transfer credit is prepared by the Graduate Program and submitted for approval by the program faculty and the school's Associate Dean of Graduate Studies.

New standard 10.8

The institution publishes policies for evaluating, awarding and accepting credit not originating from the institution. The institution ensures (a) the academic quality of any credit or coursework recorded on its transcript, (b) an approval process with oversight by persons academically qualified to make the necessary judgments, and (c) the credit awarded is comparable to a designated credit experience and is consistent with the institution's mission. **(Evaluating and awarding academic credit)**

Although the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee had no findings regarding Comprehensive Standard 3.4.4, (Acceptance of academic credit), the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee was asked to review this standard, as revised and renumbered as new standard 10.8, due to the institution's self-disclosure of inappropriate awarding of grades to students enrolled in non-credit courses at two external institutions. Standard 10.8 brings together CS 3.4.4. and CS 3.4.8, taking into account policies for awarding academic credit for transfer and for non-credit coursework, and clearly establishing that institutions are ultimately responsible for the academic credit taught by others that they transcript.

In its Compliance Certification, the institution had previously indicated that: *"The University of Texas at Dallas (UT Dallas) does not award academic credit for non-academic coursework, including vocational, developmental or remedial studies, nor does it grant credit for prior experiential learning."* However, the institution's plans for corrective actions to address the matter described in its self-disclosure included establishing a retrospective MOU to articulate the non-credit coursework offered by the two police institutes, which in effect would be awarding credit for non-credit coursework—an activity for which the institution does not appear to have a published policy.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the graduate catalog section on transfer credit and Policy on Procedures for Completing a Graduate Degree-UTDPP1052. Both of these documents place requirements on the courses to be transferred, such as a grade of B or better, no credit transferred until after the student has completed 9 semester credit hours of courses at UT Dallas with a grade point average of at least 3.0, and limiting the total amount of credit to be transferred to no more than 25% of the total master's degree requirements. This policy does

not address awarding credit for non-credit coursework.

The original compliance report stated: *"Because there are a series of cross-checks where multiple participants-faculty, associate deans, and professional reviewers - determine whether the credit to be transferred is aligned with the content taught in a UT Dallas academic degree program, the university assures that the transfer credit is comparable to the university's course credit. These multiple reviewers, especially the individual program faculty, ensure that the content of the courses transferred are at the proper collegiate level and that they are aligned with educational content in UT Dallas programs..."*. However, the institution did not provide compelling documentation that the *"credit to be transferred is aligned with the content taught in a UT Dallas academic degree program"* or *"is comparable to the university's course credit"* or *"that the content of the courses transferred are at the proper collegiate level and that they are aligned with educational content in UT Dallas programs"*. While the Criminal Justice faculty indicated in interview that they spent 90 minutes reviewing the non-credit courses and a chart that proposed course equivalencies, some noted that this was an inadequate amount of time to fully vet the courses and review the documents distributed during the meeting.

Recommendation 2: Principle 10.8, Evaluating and awarding academic credit:

The Committee recommends that the institution publish policies for evaluating and awarding credit for non-credit coursework not originating from the institution. Through this policy, the institution is expected to (a) ensure the quality of any credit or coursework recorded on its transcript, (b) ensure an approval process with oversight by persons academically qualified to make the necessary judgments, and (c) ensure that the credit awarded is comparable to a designated credit experience and is consistent with the institution's mission.

- 3.4.5** The institution publishes academic policies that adhere to principles of good educational practice. These policies are disseminated to students, faculty, and other interested parties through publications that accurately represent the programs and services of the institution. **(Academic policies)**

The institution has published academic policies on faculty work, evaluation, academic program development and program review, student enrollment, student progress and support, and other aspects of academic programming consistent with good educational practice. Policies are aligned with THECB guidelines and are accessible via the institutional Handbook of Operating Procedures accessible via the online Policy Navigator. A process is in place to review and update published policies on a regular basis, and to ensure alignment between policy documents and the published catalog during the annual catalog review.

- 3.4.6** The institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery. **(Practices for awarding credit)**

The institution awards academic credits that meet the requirements of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for all courses. A policy statement is published online as the Semester Credit Hour Value (UTDPP1090). Credit hour standards are published for all courses in the Catalog and credit is awarded for distance-education and online courses according to the same standards.

The curriculum approval and review process ensures that all courses meet the policy

standards for content, outcomes, methods, evaluation, and credit. Faculty members within each discipline develop courses for program faculty review. Undergraduate courses are then reviewed by the Council for Undergraduate Education; graduate courses are similarly reviewed by the Graduate Council. Recommendations are made to the Committee on Educational Policy which will then review the course for assignment of university credit. Final approval is obtained from the Academic Senate.

- 3.4.7** The institution ensures the quality of educational programs and courses offered through consortia relationships or contractual agreements, ensures ongoing compliance with the *Principles* and periodically evaluates the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the mission of the institution. (See the Commission policy “Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.”) **(Consortia relationships/contractual agreements) New standard 10.9**

The institution describes multiple consortial arrangements in support of interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate educational programs with institutional partners in the University of Texas System and external academic institutions.

Memoranda of Understanding, cooperative and other program agreements provide details of roles and responsibilities of all partners. However, information and documentation of periodic evaluation for these arrangements was not provided for the consideration of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that UT-Dallas did not provide “information and documentation of periodic evaluation” of its various consortial relationships. In its Focused Response Report, UT-Dallas provided explanations of the review process for its consortial relationships as well as samples of editing of catalog pages and how information on the relationships is disseminated.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee explored compliance with this principle during a series of campus meetings. In interviews with the International Partnership Development Director, the Associate Provost and Dean of the Honors College, the Assistant Vice President for Contract Administration, and the University Attorney, UT Dallas’ review process for cooperative academic arrangements was explained, and evidence of the regular evaluation of MOUs was provided.

- 3.4.8** The institution awards academic credit for course work taken on a noncredit basis only when there is documentation that the noncredit course work is equivalent to a designated credit experience. **(Noncredit to credit) New standard 10.8**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee deemed the principle to be non-applicable to the institution because UT-Dallas indicated in its Admissions Policies (as stated in the Undergraduate Catalog) that it does not award credit for non-academic coursework.

New standard 10.8

The institution publishes policies for evaluating, awarding and accepting credit not originating from the institution. The institution ensures (a) the academic quality of any credit or coursework recorded on its transcript, (b) an approval process with oversight by persons academically qualified to make the necessary judgments, and (c) the credit awarded is comparable to a designated credit experience and is consistent with

the institution's mission. **(Evaluating and awarding academic credit)**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found the institution in compliance with principle 3.4.8, Non-Credit to Credit (because the university stated it did not award credit for non-credit coursework). However, the institution's self-disclosure of inappropriate awarding of grades, which included one academic program at the university accepting non-credit coursework for academic credit, compelled the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee to review principle 10.8 (Evaluating and awarding academic credit). See the narrative at CS 3.4.4 for the Committee's findings related to 10.8. (Note that Standard 10.8 brings together CS 3.4.4, and CS 3.4.8, taking into account policies for awarding academic credit for transfer and for non-credit coursework, and clearly establishing that institutions are ultimately responsible for the academic credit taught by others that they transcript.)

3.4.9 The institution provides appropriate academic support services. (Academic support services)

The institution provides a comprehensive set of academic support services for its students and faculty. Services are available to distance education students as well as to traditional students. Services range from those that are directly tied to specific courses to broader services designed to help students with general academic preparation and planning. These services are evaluated on an annual basis using a variety of institutional benchmarks including usage statistics, consumer evaluations, staff evaluations, and overall student success in academic programs. Of particular note is the Student Success Center that organizes and delivers peer-assisted academic support programs in a wide variety of areas, including; financial well-being, oral presentation skill development, writing center, math lab, supplemental group instruction, peer- tutoring, coaching/mentoring, and testing skills. The Center for Teaching and Learning supports faculty including graduate teaching assistants, post-doctoral associates, part-time lecturers, non-tenure track faculty, and tenure track faculty members. Campus wide training programs and personnel are supplemented by "teaching leaders" and associated programming to improve the educational experience for students.

3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of its curriculum with its faculty. (Responsibility for curriculum)

Faculty members maintain primary responsibility for curriculum content, quality, oversight and effectiveness of the institution's educational programs. The responsibility of the faculty to develop and provide ongoing oversight and assessment of the educational program curriculum is described in institutional policies; Faculty Governance (UTDPP1088) and Committee on Educational Policy (UTDPP1023) are two examples.

All academic programs are reviewed periodically to evaluate their quality and their effectiveness in supporting the institution's mission. The Academic Program Review policy (UTDPP1013) is the defining document for this process. These reviews may be conducted as internal self-studies or external program reviews, and the Program Review Committee maintains oversight of the process. Each academic program is assessed annually and reviewed by faculty. Samples of internal self-studies, external program reviews and annual assessment demonstrate evidence of consistency of policy and practice.

***3.4.11 For each major in a degree program, the institution assigns responsibility for program**

coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field. In those degree programs for which the institution does not identify a major, this requirement applies to a curricular area or concentration. **(Academic program coordination) New standard 6.2.c**

The Compliance Certification states that a committee reviewed the list of program coordinators and found that most held the terminal degree in the relevant subject area or a related area. However, the list of programs and coordinators provided in the Supporting Documents did not provide the degrees or other credentials for any of the coordinators, which necessitated a review of each individual coordinator record using the online Faculty Book. The degrees and academic and other credentials for all program directors could be accessed with the exception of two; coordinators for the Ph.D. in Cognition and Neuroscience and the MBA online. Additionally, the curricula vitae for two academic leads (Energy Management and Innovation and Entrepreneurship) did not provide evidence of expertise in the area, and other documentation such as transcripts was not provided.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed credentials of all program coordinators, including four program coordinators for whom there was technical difficulty for the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee in accessing their transcripts and CVs. The committee also met with faculty from JSOM programs on Energy Management and Innovation and Entrepreneurship to discuss faculty committee's roles and collaboration with program directors for course review and approval. All of the coordinators were found to have appropriate education and/or background experience.

3.4.12 The institution's use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs. Students have access to and training in the use of technology. **(Technology use)**

The institution's use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs. Students have adequate access to training in the use of technology, as do faculty. The institution recognizes the importance of technology to all its programs and supports a strong technology infrastructure, including a 10Gbps fiber-optic backbone. Core technology services and enterprise applications are provided centrally by cross-disciplinary teams from the Office of Information Technology (OIT). Specialized academic technology is supported within each college by distributed information technology staff. An Information Security Office works with central and distributed IT, internal audit, and business continuity services to ensure data integrity and adherence to federal, state, and local laws. The Educational Technology Services Department focus is on supporting distance students and campus multimedia needs. OIT assigns all students and faculty members a NetID to enable resource access. Galaxy, a campus portal, allows students to conduct university business and manage their records. OIT manages the campus Help Desk and two general purpose computer labs, while academic units manage specialty labs. The institution maintains a public list of all labs for student and faculty reference. The library houses an adaptive technology room. Students and faculty have access to training in the use of technology, including the Help Desk, online guides, and in- person workshops and trainings offered by members of OIT, the Library, and the eLearning Team.

3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them. **(General education competencies) New standard 8.2.b**

The institution originally defined five core competencies around which the Core Curriculum was designed as part of the development of undergraduate programming in 1990. From 1999 and 2014, students were expected to meet Core Curricular objectives by completing specified credit hours of coursework in Communications, Math/Quant Methods, Natural Science, Humanities, Fine Arts, U.S. History, TX Government and Politics, and Social/Behavioral Sciences. The institution proposed a revised and significantly streamlined core curriculum to align with THECB revised Texas Core Curriculum, which was approved in 2014. Revision of the institution's Core Curriculum has continued since then, with some proposed new courses being approved by the state agency for inclusion.

Core Curricular objectives are designed based on THECB and AAC&U Value objectives. The institution uses the validated CLA+ assessment as a pre-/post- test approach to assess student progress in core areas. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that since the institution implemented use of the CLA+ assessment, fewer than 5% of students have taken the post-test, so it was unclear what conclusions may be supported by the data. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee also understood that Comets to the Core, a second institutional assessment, was to be discontinued, and noted a lack of additional evidence for monitoring the students' level of work in core courses or assessing student gains therefrom.

In the Focused Response Report, the institution affirmed that Comets to the Core has not been discontinued and is being used in conjunction with CLA+ assessment to assess the core curriculum. Since the combination of these two methods of assessment has been in use only since 2017, there are little data currently available, although there is a process in place for the analysis and assessment of the measures.

Between Fall 2014 and Spring 2017, the University used a combination of the CLA+ as pre- and post-test and a group project to assess general education core competencies; however, because the group project was difficult to manage and ultimately led to problems with data collection, and because students often are taking core classes through their junior and even senior years, the University elected to revise the core assessment process as described above.

Since the current assessment process has only been in place for one complete semester, the university does not have data to demonstrate student achievement of all core outcomes. However, the institution has made changes based on results. Having noted the fact that the data from 2014-2017 were not providing clear and helpful results of core competencies, the Core Curriculum Committee began revising the general education assessment measures to ensure better data. The group project and CLA+ pretest were moved from the freshman seminar to a required non-credit UNIV course, taken in the first few weeks of the first semester of the freshman year; the focus of the group project was changed from a discipline-specific topic to a more broad-based problem, allowing for interdisciplinary approaches; and a second required non-credit UNIV course, to be taken during the junior year, was created in which students will take the CLA+ as a post-test and undertake a second group project. A survey of students participating in the first offering of the revised UNIV course in Fall 2017 was developed by the Office of Assessment and administered in Spring 2018; a focus group of participating students was also held in Spring 2018. The Core Curriculum Committee is already making adjustments to the non-credit UNIV course for Fall 2018 to improve the experience based on the indirect data gathered. In an additional effort to improve general education assessment effectiveness, the institution also changed the membership of the Core Curriculum Committee from all associate deans (who also served as the Council for Undergraduate Education) to faculty teaching core classes in each of the schools to enable

the dissemination of assessment information more directly to core curriculum faculty.

Thus, for its general education competencies in undergraduate education, UT Dallas has identified expected outcomes, has revised and, as of Fall 2017, instituted improved assessments to measure the extent to which it achieves those outcomes, and is making changes to improve the quality of the data being collected as well as the dissemination of the results of the assessments.

- 3.5.2** At least 25 percent of the credit hours required for the degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. *(See the Commission policy "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.")* **(Institutional credits for a degree)**.

The graduation requirements for undergraduate degree programs are included in the Undergraduate Catalog and specify that 45 semester credit hours must be taken at the institution (also applies to online programs) and 24 of the last 30 semester credit hours must all be taken at the institution. Compliance is monitored via degree audits conducted by advisors after students have earned 45 semester credits and 75 semester credits toward the degree.

The institution has several dual degree programs with non-SACSCOC accredited international institutions. For each, practices are in place to ensure that at least 25% of undergraduate credits are earned at the institution.

- 3.5.3** The institution publishes requirements for its undergraduate programs, including its general education components. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. *(See the Commission policy "The Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees.")* **(Undergraduate program requirements)**

Requirements for undergraduate programs as well as general education components are published in the Undergraduate Catalog and on the websites of the individual programs. The general education core curriculum requires 42 semester credits and covers six components: communication, mathematics, life/physical sciences, language, philosophy and culture; creative arts; American history, government, social and behavioral science and a six-credit option for the campus or program to specify.

Specific degree requirements may also be found in the catalog and include a program description; number of credits required; core curriculum requirements; lower- and upper-division program requirements; elective requirements; and, course descriptions. The program requirements conform to accepted standards and have been approved at the campus level as well as by the THECB.

- 3.5.4** At least 25 percent of the course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty members holding an appropriate terminal degree—usually the earned doctorate or the equivalent of the terminal degree. **(Terminal degrees of faculty)**

The listing of faculty in each major who hold the appropriate terminal degree showed that Music had fewer than the required 25% of the course hours taught by appropriately credentialed faculty. For fall 2016, 18.2% of the courses were taught by individuals with the terminal degree. For spring 2017, the percentage was 20.6. The narrative indicated that the

MFA is considered a "doctorate equivalent", but there was no mention of whether faculty with these degrees would be counted in the "terminal degree" category. All other programs met the 25% requirement.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee did not consider this standard there is no correlating standard in the newly adopted 2018 edition of the Principles of Accreditation.

- 3.6.1** The institution's post-baccalaureate professional degree programs, and its master's and doctoral degree programs, are progressively more advanced in academic content than its undergraduate programs. **(Post-baccalaureate program rigor)**

The institution ensures the rigor and progressive advancement of the curricula through its Council on Graduate Education review process for new and developed academic programs. This review process examines the quality of the proposal against nationally-accepted educational standards. Selected examples of external accrediting agencies include the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, the Accreditation Commission for Audiology Education and the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology. The review is initiated by the school's faculty with recommendations to the dean and Provost's Office. Reviews continue to the University of Texas System's Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and finally to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for approval.

The institution offers a limited number of concurrent courses for undergraduate and graduate students. There is a specific approval process initiated by the department and approved by the dean on a semester by semester basis. The Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination reviews the student learning outcomes and assignments to affirm that there is a significant difference in expectations for undergraduate and graduate students. Approval is granted when the graduate student syllabus demonstrates substantially-advanced work.

The institution has provided further evidence for progressive rigor and complexity of degree programs with sample course descriptions and periodic evaluations per its Academic Program Review Policy (UTDPP1013), for baccalaureate and graduate level degree programs.

- 3.6.2** The institution structures its graduate curricula (1) to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (2) to ensure ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences. **(Graduate curriculum)**

All academic programs include the literature of the disciplines in the curriculum. Research content and activities are included in the curricula of academic programs at the Masters and Ph.D. levels. Clinical and Practicum experiences are included in the curricula of the programs dedicated to educating healthcare professionals.

- 3.6.3** At least one-third of credits toward a graduate or a post-baccalaureate professional degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. *(See the Commission policy "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.")* **(Institutional credits for a degree)**

The institution has policy restricting transfer credits for graduate degrees to no more than 25% of the total required credits. This policy is published in the Graduate Catalog. The

institution has procedures for petitioning for transfer credit, including coursework from domestic in-state or international institutions that involves review and approval by the Institution's Council on Graduate Education and the Dean of Graduate Studies.

On-line coursework completed as part of distance programming is defined as UT Dallas coursework. For joint programs in BME and ME, students must complete one third of the coursework at UT Dallas. In this case, the joint program is indicated on the transcript. For dual degree programs, the procedure for transferring credits from the home institution is defined, and both institutions confer degrees for the two programs separately.

3.6.4 The institution defines and publishes requirements for its graduate and post-graduate professional programs. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. **(Post-baccalaureate program requirements)**

The institution defines and publishes educational graduation requirements for each academic program in its Graduate Catalog including detailed information regarding admissions, transfer of credits, and degree requirements.

The academic requirements follow the guidelines of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, the University of Texas System, and standard practice for such academic programs as determined by external accrediting agencies, nationally accepted criteria, and program reviews. Program reviews are performed periodically and for curricular or policy changes. The Office of Graduate Studies retains primary responsibility for the coordination of all aspects of graduate education degree program requirements. Graduate program policies and procedures are published on the office's website.

3.7.1 The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. *(See Commission guidelines "Faculty Credentials.")* **(Faculty competence) New standard 6.2.a**

The institution has a procedure for confirming the credentials of all faculty hired. All earned degrees, with institutional affiliation, are published for all full-time and part-time faculty in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs. Faculty credentials, evaluation and teaching assignments are reflected in documentation available through a searchable "FacBook" database. Documents provided to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee through the institution's CCR were difficult to access due to insufficient labeling and broken links, making the credential evaluation process cumbersome and inefficient. Insufficient information was provided for some faculty to adequately assess instructional credentials (see Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty).

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the complete list of UT Dallas faculty credentials with the exception of 42 faculty members whose credentials were difficult to examine for technical reasons. The institution's Focused Report produced a complete list of

credentials and courses taught with justification for those 42 faculty members. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed all of those justifications and a sample of instructor transcripts and found all faculty members and graduate students teaching classes to be qualified by education, research and experience to teach the courses for which they were responsible.

3.7.2 The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty evaluation)

The institution has developed policies related to three periods of review: annual reviews (UTDPP1089 for full-time faculty and UTDPP1061 for part-time faculty); promotion and tenure reviews (UTDPP1077); and post-tenure reviews. Policies for evaluation are accessed in the online Policy Navigator. All faculty, regardless of tenure status or full/part-time status are evaluated annually by the unit administrator. Faculty performance during these reviews form the basis for merit raises. Tenure eligible faculty are evaluated in the third year of the probationary period and all tenured faculty undergo a post-tenure review not less than once every six years.

3.7.3 The institution provides evidence of ongoing professional development of faculty as teachers, scholars, and practitioners. (Faculty development)

The institution provides regular opportunities for full-time faculty to pursue faculty development through the Special Faculty Development Assignment program. This assignment releases the faculty member from teaching for one year in order to pursue major projects of benefit to the individual or the university. On average, ~2% of faculty are selected to participate annually, with about a quarter of the full-time faculty supported through the SFDA program since 2008. New Faculty Orientation and faculty mentoring programs are available for faculty in their first years. The mentoring program is evaluated for impact on an annual basis. Faculty development is supported by a university Senate Committee on Effective Teaching in coordination with similar committees in each of the schools. A new Center for Teaching and Learning launched in 2016 provides workshops and other faculty programming. All of these programs report to the Provost.

3.7.4 The institution ensures adequate procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom. (Academic freedom) New standard 6.4

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and the University Of Texas System Board Of Regents have in place administrative codes and standards recognizing academic freedom. The institution has procedures and safeguards for faculty by policy documents describing the granting of tenure, advancements, grievance and governance procedures including: General Standards and Procedures regarding Initial Appointments to the Ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor (UTDPP1057); Faculty Promotion, Reappointment, and Tenure (UTDPP1077); Faculty Governance (UTDPP1088); and Faculty Conduct (UTDPP1049). However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to locate institutional procedures that specifically address academic freedom. An explicit definition of academic freedom was not found in the institution's Handbook of Operating Procedures policy documents.

In its Focused Response Report, the institution explains that the definition of academic freedom was inadvertently removed when the online Faculty Handbook was deactivated in

2016. The university has reinstated the "Rights and Responsibilities of Faculty Members" webpage, on which it has clearly identified the academic freedom statement and a link to the AAUP 1940 Statement on Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. As of January 2018, this information was also included on the Academic Senate's webpage.

Further, UT-Dallas provided the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee a thorough explanation of its statement in its Compliance Certification report that "there is neither a single UT Dallas policy defining academic freedom nor a single committee or office" responsible. The University has provided links to the five relevant policies contained in its Handbook of Operating Procedures and explanations of how each works to protect academic freedom in teaching, research, and publication. It also explains the role of the Academic Senate, the Committee on Qualifications, and the Faculty Grievance Procedure.

3.7.5 The institution publishes policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters. (Faculty role in governance)

The UT System Board of Regents Rules and Regulations outline the role of faculty in governance and requires that institutions within the system provide faculty a major governance role around academic issues. The institution complies with these rules through policies (UTDPP1088 and UTDPP1007) in the online Handbook of Operating Procedures. At the campus level, faculty governance bodies include the General Faculty, Academic Senate, Academic Council, Senate Committees, and University Committees.

The General Faculty holds one meeting annually and this body can override Senate decisions. The Academic Senate is an elected body and governs via a committee structure. The Senate publishes its agendas and minutes on the website.

Faculty governance bodies also exist at the school level with these faculty organizations required to have bylaws on shared governance. At the system level, the Faculty Advisory Council provides advice to the Chancellor and Regents.

Two specific examples of shared governance were provided in the Compliance Certification. The first was a review and subsequent linking of the annual review and periodic performance review process. A second involved the development of a conflict of commitment policy.

3.8.1 The institution provides facilities and learning/information resources that are appropriate to support its teaching, research, and service mission. (Learning/information resources)

The institution provides facilities and learning/information resources that are appropriate to support its teaching, research, and service mission in the form of a main campus library and several smaller satellite facilities. The main library is part of 220,000 square foot, multi-use facility which the library shares with complimentary partners, such as the Student Success Center and several student labs.

The main library occupies 55% of the facility, is ADA compliant, and has undergone several renovations. The second floor was renovated in 2005 and the third floor in 2015 to meet the demands of changing service patterns, including a single service point, new tables, chairs, lighting, carpet, and electrics. The facility provides library study space, labs and an instruction classroom including: 17 group study rooms, numerous individual study seats, an accessibility room, 24 circulating laptops, and 82 computers.

Feedback on library services is obtained through formal and informal actions, including an online library comment form, a fine appeals document, Library Liaisons, faculty and student surveys, both in-house and utilizing LibQual, a national library survey tool. A Library Committee, composed of campus faculty and staff, reviews and provides input to ensure that library services and collections meet the needs of users. Library survey feedback has been used to shape expanded library hours and seating preferences.

The Library has published building use policies. The Student Success Center is located in the main library and offers such services as: Comet Cents Financial Success Program, Communication Lab (CommLab), Math Lab, Supplemental Instruction (SI) in historically difficult courses, Peer Led Team Learning (PLTL) for science and math courses, Academic Success Coaching, Peer Tutoring, Writing Center, Testing Center, and Coordinated Group Study. Academic Computing offers several general purpose labs, a campus Help Desk, and a published list of services and resources available across the campus. The Library's website serves as the main portal for services for distance and off-site students and faculty.

3.8.2 The institution ensures that users have access to regular and timely instruction in the use of the library and other learning/information resources. (Instruction of library use)

The institution ensures users have access to regular and timely instruction in the use of the library and other learning/information resources through individualized and group instruction and consultation sessions, orientation sessions, tours, workshops, online resource research guides and video tutorials, and in-person, telephone, and email reference services. A librarian is assigned to each of the institution's eight schools and serves to enhance outreach and communication. Librarians teach several credit courses, including a one-credit course for undergraduates, a three-credit course for graduate students, and an online, three-credit course for a healthcare degree. An instructional design librarian ensures that teaching content is accessible and follows best practices. Librarians also teach one-shot instruction sessions at the request of faculty.

Library personnel follow the Association of Research Libraries Framework in class preparation. Librarians gather student evaluations to assess class and course success. Strategic goals include reaching each student during his/her first year, and then again when a degree is selected. First year students generally receive library instruction via either a UNIV 1010 or Rhetoric 1302. One-on-one research consultations are available upon request. Online tutorials and subject guides are available to students at the point of need, and are of particular value to distance education students. The library uses social media, among several pathways, to inform students of available resources.

The Library's information literacy program continues to grow in popularity. In 2015-2016, librarians taught 175 classes, 61 workshops, 33 tours, and 298 research consultations, reaching combined total of 7346 patrons. The library continues to work towards expanding its contact, for example a Graduate Student Workshop Series was recently implemented to reach more computer and engineering students. Walk-up, chat, and phone reference assistance is available 81 hours per week. A Library Liaison program assigns a librarian to each school to enhance outreach and communication. Distance and off-site students are able to work with librarians via email, phone, or Skype to address instructional needs, or through online tutorials and subject guides. Several of the programs reporting under the Student Success Program provide instructional support to students, such as Writing Center, Math Lab, Tutoring, and Supplemental Instruction.

3.8.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or

experiences in library and/or other learning/information resources— to accomplish the mission of the institution. **(Qualified staff)**

The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff, with appropriate education and experience, to accomplish the educational mission of the institution. A staff roster, job descriptions and curriculum vita demonstrates all library professional have a master's degree from an ALA-accredited program, including eight with doctorates, or appropriate position credentials or experience. A review of CVs indicates that the institution has engaged librarians who maintain appropriate organizational memberships and participate in professional and research activities at the local, state, and national level, as well as ongoing, continuing education. 33 support staff and 4.5 FTE student assistants complete the staffing picture as demonstrated via an organizational chart. The Library's 2015 LibQual survey of campus satisfaction indicates the campus community is satisfied with library services and staff. The Student Success Center provides a full roster and numerous examples of job descriptions to demonstrate an engaged and appropriately credentialed staff. Educational Technology Services or the eLearning Team, provide appropriate job descriptions and credentialed staff.

3.9.1 The institution publishes a clear and appropriate statement of student rights and responsibilities and disseminates the statement to the campus community. **(Student rights)**

The University of Texas at Dallas Student Catalog (both graduate and undergraduate) provide students with access to policies and procedures, rules, regulations and statutory requirements pertaining to their rights. These rules and policy statements are consistent with the University of Texas System Board of Regents Rules and Regulations. The Catalogs are easily available on the institutions website. Sample links are provided. Initial notice of the rights and responsibilities of students is disseminated through student orientation programs. Students are reminded of these policies each semester when they receive the A to Z Guide via US Mail. Course syllabus templates also provide links to this information.

3.9.2 The institution protects the security, confidentiality, and integrity of its student records and maintains security measures to protect and back up data. **(Student records)**

The University of Texas at Dallas has extensive policies and procedures in place for protection and confidentiality of student records. The institution's Information Security and Acceptable Use policy was provided as a supporting document. The institution maintains student records for all its students in the PeopleSoft Campus Solutions system, which is managed by University of Texas Shared Information Services. This system is backed up on a nightly basis, and all data are replicated between the primary and secondary data center maintained by UT System in a geographically separate area. No confidential student record data are stored outside a University of Texas data center in an unencrypted format, and all appropriate measures are in place to prevent interception by unauthorized parties.

Electronic and paper records are maintained appropriately and in accordance with the UT Dallas Records Management and Retention schedule, a copy of which is provided in the documentation. Personally identifiable information is transmitted via encrypted email. Individual student records are also maintained in secure environments by other student affairs offices, including the Dean of Students, the Office of Community Standards and Conduct, the Student Health Center, the Student Counseling Center, the International Center, Career Center, Student AccessAbility, the Office of the Registrar, the Office of Admission and Enrollment, and the Office of Financial Aid. FERPA guides the entire campus

on matters related to the confidentiality of student education records. Students in attendance are notified annually of their rights pursuant to FERPA via an official email communication issued from the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Dean's staff receive FERPA training annually.

3.9.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experience in the student affairs area—to accomplish the mission of the institution. **(Qualified staff)**

Professional staff members in the area of student services are appropriately qualified and academically prepared to serve in their specific roles. The institution provided an organizational chart for the Student Affairs Division and complete roster of staff. Resumes for the leadership team were also provided, twenty- seven of whom hold advanced degrees including six earned doctorates. Evidence of opportunities for growth and development was provided, including a comprehensive professional development initiative made up of five component parts; onboarding, professional development, recognition and awards, service, and social. During fiscal 2016, approximately 125 staff members participated in at least one conference, workshop or seminar.

3.10.1 The institution's recent financial history demonstrates financial stability. **(Financial stability)**

A review of the key financial indicators for 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 shows the institution meets the requirement to demonstrate financial stability. Revenues increased \$212M during this period of time. While the debt burden ratio has increased to 8.4% in 2016, debt service coverage ratio has improved to 2.5%. While the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee did not have access to the most recent audit, the trend data suggest that the institution has a history of financial stability.

***3.10.2** The institution audits financial aid programs as required by federal and state regulations. **(Financial aid audits) New standard 13.6**

The institution has demonstrated that its financial aid programs have been audited. The Texas State Auditor's Office performed an audit of student financial aid audit for FY 2016 including Federal Pell Grants and Federal Direct Student Loans.

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found the institution had demonstrated that its financial aid programs have been audited. The Texas State Auditor's Office performed the student financial aid audit for FY 2016, including Federal Pell Grants and Federal Direct Loans.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee review encompassed a wide variety of documents (over 15) provided by the University of Texas at Dallas including: State of Texas Auditor reports, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Reporting Manuals and Procedures, Financial Aid Databases, Reconciliation and Reporting procedures, FISAP report, and compliance reports.

During the site visit, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee had a chance to review the university's financial aid audits and talk with the financial aid administrative team. The Committee met with the Executive Vice President, the Vice President for Budget and

Finance, the Associate Vice President and Controller, and the Director of Financial Aid. The University of Texas at Dallas reports that 45% of students received some form of federal or state aid during 2016-2017. Federal aid disbursements totaled more than \$93.6 million, of which federal Pell grants accounted for \$23.1 million and Federal Direct Student Loans \$69.8 million. The State of Texas provided grants and aid of \$49.6 million during this time period.

The fiscal year 2016 audit report, which was finalized in January 2017, noted one instance of non-compliance in relation to reporting. The institution corrected this upon notice and the State Auditor's office completed a follow up review noting partial completion.

In addition, the university submits to the federal government an annual Fiscal Operations Report and Application to Participate (FISAP). The institution has been in good standing and has had no limitation or suspensions from the Department of Education.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted interviews in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee

3.10.3 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its financial resources. (Control of finances)

The university has demonstrated that it exercises appropriate control over its finances through its system of financial controls, compliance programs (UT System policy UTS119), UTDBP3034 University Endowment Policy, and internal audit program.

3.10.4 The institution maintains financial control over externally funded or sponsored research and programs. (Control of sponsored research/external funds)

The institution has demonstrated financial oversight of externally funded activities and sponsored research through its system of pre-award, post-award, accounting and financial reporting, policies (e.g. Intellectual Property Rule 90101, Research Conflict of Interest UTDP1029), compliance programs (Animal Care committee, Biosafety committee, Human Subjects), and training programs.

3.11.1 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its physical resources. (Control of physical resources)

The institution has demonstrated appropriate control over its physical resources through its facilities planning process (2010 Master Plan), property management function, capital improvement program, two categories of deferred maintenance program, property control, facilities inventory, insurance program, and audit program.

3.11.2 The institution takes reasonable steps to provide a healthy, safe, and secure environment for all members of the campus community. (Institutional environment)

The institution has implemented systems and processes to minimize risks and provide a healthy, safe and secure environment including University Safety and Security Council, Environmental Health and Safety, Emergency Management, Risk and Insurance

Management, Environmental Management, Research Compliance (laboratory safety, hazardous waste, training), Police Department, Human Resources, and Information Technology security. These are in keeping with common and accepted practices in higher education.

- *3.11.3** The institution operates and maintains physical facilities, both on and off campus, that appropriately serve the needs of the institution's educational programs, support services, and other mission-related activities. **(Physical facilities) New standard 13.7**

The institution has provided documentation of having adequate and well-maintained facilities that support its programs and enable the institution to achieve its educational goals and serve its constituents at its various locations. The University has added 2 million gross square feet from 2012 to 2016. Supporting documentation included a 2010 Master Plan, which is slated to be updated under the new president.

The university employs standard good practices to ensure that physical facilities and information technology resources are both appropriate for the needs of the institution's educational programs, support services and other activities and are adequate for those needs. The university's Campus Master Plan directly connected plans for development to (1) the anticipated enrollment growth and (2) the plan for expansion of the university's research activity. Multiple surveys (Sightlines, Benchworks) illustrate efforts to ensure adequacy of the physical resources by assessing sufficiency relative to both UTD student expectations and national standards, and prioritizing areas for attention.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed *UT Dallas Campus Site Development Plan 2008-2050* and conducted interviews with the VP for Administration, the Associate VP for Facilities Management, the Director of Physical Plant Services, VP for Budget and Finance, the AVP and Controller, Chair of UT Dallas SACSCOC Financial and Physical Resources and Information Technology Committee, VP for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, Senior Director of Administrative and Client Services, in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- 3.12.1** The institution notifies the Commission of changes in accordance with the Commission's substantive change policy and, when required, seeks approval prior to the initiation of changes. *(See the Commission policy "Substantive Changes for Accredited Institutions.")*
(Substantive change)

The institution has a clearly defined substantive change policy that is modeled on the SACSCOC policy statement entitled, "Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions." The policies for various types of substantive change are shown in the "UTD Substantive Change Matrix" and "Reporting the Various Types of Substantive Change." Copies of forms for reporting substantive change to SACSCOC, the UT System, and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board are provided. Copies of correspondence to and from SACSCOC concerning substantive change are also provided.

- 3.13** The institution complies with the policies of the Commission on Colleges. **(Policy compliance)**

- *3.13.1 "Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies" New standard 14.4**

Applicable Policy Statement. Any institution seeking or holding accreditation from more than one U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting body must describe itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies, and must keep each institutional accrediting body apprised of any change in its status with one or another accrediting body.

Documentation: The institution should (1) list federally recognized agencies that currently accredit the institution or any of its programs, (2) provide the date of the most recent review by each agency and indicate if negative action was taken by the agency and the reason for such action, (3) provide copies of statements used to describe itself for each of the accrediting bodies, (4) indicate any agency that has terminated accreditation, the date, and the reason for termination, and (5) indicate the date and reason for the institution voluntarily withdrawing accreditation with any of the agencies.

The institution is accredited by only one body other than SACSCOC that is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education: the American Speech-Language Hearing Association, Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (ASHA, CAA). UT Dallas' Audiology and Communication Disorders programs were last reviewed by ASHA in 2015; no negative actions were taken (letter from ASHA provided). A copy of the summary statement provided to ASHA described the institution in the same manner that the University has been described for the 2018 SACSCOC reaffirmation materials.

Other academic programs at the university are accredited by nationally recognized accrediting agencies specific to their respective discipline. These accreditors include the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), the American Chemical Society, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the Project Management Institute Global Accreditation Center (PMI), and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). Although these are not currently U.S. DOE recognized accreditors, the institution states that none has taken negative action against the university or its programs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee's review of the documentation confirms that the institution's audiology and communication disorders programs are accredited by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association, Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (ASHA, CAA), an accreditor recognized by the US Department of Education. The institution provided evidence that it describes itself in identical terms to ASHA, CAA, and SACSCOC. After a review of the institution's 2014 Self-Studies of the doctoral program in Audiology and the master's program in Speech Language Pathology and recent annual reports submitted to the Council on Academic Accreditation and interviews with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination, and the Associate Dean and Program Head and Professor in the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

3.13.2 "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures"

Applicable Policy Statement. Member institutions are responsible for notifying and providing SACSCOC with signed final copies of agreements governing their joint and dual academic awards (as defined in this policy). These awards must address the requirements set forth in

the SACSCOC policy and procedures. For all such arrangements, SACSCOC-accredited institutions assume responsibility for (1) the integrity of the awards, (2) the quality of credits recorded on their transcripts, and (3) compliance with accreditation requirements

Documentation: The institution should provide evidence that it has reported to the Commission all dual and joint awards (as defined in this policy) that included signed final copies of the agreements outlining the awards. In addition, the institution should integrate into the Compliance Certification a discussion and determination of compliance with all standards applicable to the provisions of the agreements.

The institution has a number of agreements with other institutions. The Compliance Certification provided documentation of SACSCOC approval for degrees in biomedical engineering and MD/MBA with U.S. institutions and for programs with international institutions.

***3.13.3 “Complaint Procedures Against the Commission or Its Accredited Institutions”**

Applicable Policy Statement. Each institution is required to have in place student complaint policies and procedures that are reasonable, fairly administered, and well-publicized. (See *FR 4.5*). The Commission also requires, in accord with federal regulations, that each institution maintains a record of complaints received by the institution. This record is made available to the Commission upon request. This record will be reviewed and evaluated by the Commission as part of the institution's decennial evaluation.

New standard 12.4 The institution (a) publishes appropriate and clear procedures for addressing written student complaints, (b) demonstrates that it follows the procedures when resolving them, and (c) maintains a record of student complaints that can be accessed upon request by SACSCOC. (*Student complaints*)

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed evidence confirming that the institution has established policies for the resolution of complaints. The formal policies, hearing procedures, and timeframes for handling complaints are published and clear. Evidence was provided that procedures for documenting and addressing individual complaints have been established, as well as documentation that the institution follows these procedures. The elements of the complaint record include the date of the case, the student's name or case number, the nature of the complaint, the record of referral and the resolution. Records are located in following areas: Dean's Office, Dean of Students Office, VP for Student Affairs Office, and Associate Provost's Office.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed examples of student appeals on non-grievances, Appeals Log 2012-2013, Office of Undergraduate Education Complaint Log, Office of Graduate Education Complaint Log, Student Affairs Complaint Log 2015-2016, the Student Grievances Policy - UTDSP5005, 2017 Undergraduate Catalog, and the 2017 Graduate Catalog. In addition, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee conducted interviews with Vice President for Student Affairs, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, and Director of Assessment for Student Affairs. These actions in support of the institution's case for compliance lead the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee to affirm the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

3.13.4 “Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports”

***3.13.4.a. Applicable Policy Statement.** An institution includes a review of its distance learning programs in the Compliance Certification.

New standard 14.3 The institution applies all appropriate standards and policies to its distance learning programs, branch campuses, and off-campus instructional sites.
(Comprehensive institutional reviews)

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution had provided information regarding its distance education offerings throughout its Compliance Certification, where applicable. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed these narratives, as well as individual links to the standards in which distance education was addressed. Finally, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee interviewed the Assistant Provost and SACSCOC liaison, to confirm that the institution had applied all appropriate standards and policies to its distance learning programs and off-campus instructional sites, in support of the institution's case for compliance. Consequently, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

3.13.4.b. Applicable Policy Statement. If an institution is part of a system or corporate structure, a description of the system operation (or corporate structure) is submitted as part of the Compliance Certification for the decennial review. The description should be designed to help members of the peer review committees understand the mission, governance, and operating procedures of the system and the individual institution's role within that system.

UT at Dallas is a component of The University of Texas System. The institution provided an overview of the system's mission and governance and how the institution's role fits within.

3.13.5 "Separate Accreditation for Units of a Member Institution"

***3.13.5.a. Applicable Policy Statement.** All branch campuses related to the parent campus through corporate or administrative control (1) include the name of the parent campus and make it clear that its accreditation is dependent on the continued accreditation of the parent campus and (2) are evaluated during reviews for institutions seeking candidacy, initial membership, or reaffirmation of accreditation. All other extended units under the accreditation of the parent campus are also evaluated during such reviews.

Not Applicable

The institution has no branch campuses; therefore, this standard is not applicable.

New standard 14.1

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the institution's organizational structure and found that UTD does not operate any branch campuses, as defined by SACSCOC. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee interviewed the Provost and confirmed that this standard is not applicable to the institution, owing to the lack of branch campuses, and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

3.13.5.b. Applicable Policy Statement. If the Commission on Colleges determines that an extended unit is autonomous to the extent that the control over that unit by the parent or its board is significantly impaired, the Commission may direct that the extended unit seek to become a separately accredited institution. A unit which seeks separate accreditation should bear a different name from that of the parent. A unit which is located in a state or country

outside the geographic jurisdiction of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and which the Commission determines should be separately accredited or the institution requests to be separately accredited, applies for separate accreditation from the regional accrediting association that accredits colleges in that state or country

The institution has no autonomous branch campuses; therefore, this standard is not applicable.

- 3.14.1** A member or candidate institution represents its accredited status accurately and publishes the name, address, and telephone number of the Commission in accordance with Commission requirements and federal policy. **(Publication of accreditation status)**

The institution represents its accreditation status with SACSCOC accurately, and publishes the name, address, and telephone number of the Commission in the General Information section of its online Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs and on its web site under UT Dallas Accreditation.

D. Assessment of Compliance with Section 4: Federal Requirements

- *4.1** The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission. Criteria may include: enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations, student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals. **(Student achievement)**
New standard 8.1)

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the university is compliant in its collection and reporting of accountability data to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. The institution identifies the following criteria for student success: graduation, licensure, course completion, and job placement rates. Reasonable thresholds of acceptability have been established for each.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents provided in the institution's Compliance Certification Report and additional information provided for the site visit. The institution connected the student achievement criteria with the University's mission. UTD has clearly identified student achievement criteria for undergraduate and graduate students, set targets in most cases, and collected and analyzed data. UTD also provided a summary of the data. In some cases, UTD analyzed its student achievement data by making comparisons to peer institutions or compared the institution's own student achievement from year to year. UTD publishes student achievement goals and outcomes on the university website, as documented in a PDF of the webpage.

The institution's Compliance Certification Report provided a general statement of the use of the UT System Accountability and Performance Review, the UT System Dashboard, and the 60x30TX Texas Higher Education Accountability System in determining the metrics for enrollment, graduation rate, licensing examination pass rate, course completion rate, and job placement rate. However, UTD did not clearly articulate the target for course completion rates or explain how UTD set the targets for enrollment growth and course completion rates. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed additional licensure examination data and gathered additional information

about the process for identifying student achievement criteria and setting targets for enrollment and course completion rates. After considering the documentation and conducting an interview with the Executive Director of the Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.2** The institution's curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded. **(Program curriculum) New standard 9.1**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution offers baccalaureate, Master's and doctoral degree programs aligned with its stated mission to "provide the State of Texas and the nation with excellent, innovative education and research." Programs are designed to prepare students for the future workforce and many reflect the institution's intention to embrace non-traditional and interdisciplinary curricula. All programs meet standards set by the UT System and THECB for higher education goals in the state of Texas.

Faculty are involved in the design of all new programs. New program proposals are internally reviewed first at the school level, then through the undergraduate (or graduate) education council, followed by an institutional Committee on Educational Policy, and the Academic Senate.

All existing programs, including online programs, undergo multiple levels of review including annual assessment and periodic external program review. The review process is described in policy documents published to the institutional website.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed Chapter 5, Subchapter C, Section 5.45 of the THECB Rules and the university's Strategic Plan and mission statement, and spoke with the Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy, and the Vice Speaker of the Faculty, in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.3** The institution makes available to students and the public current academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies. **(Publication of policies) New standard 10.2**

The institution provides the entire campus community and the public with current academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies primarily via the university's website. Specific updates or reminders are sent via email to students, faculty, and/or staff when needed. The registrar posts the current and future year academic calendars on the UT Dallas website, and updates to the calendars are made as necessary based upon changes due to legislative action or administrative decisions. Refund policies are posted online in the undergraduate and graduate web catalogs, and on the Bursar's Office website. The refund policy deadlines at university are posted in an updated academic calendar format each term. Coordination of accurate and current information between the websites and the web catalog happens during the annual catalog review process. Grading scales are also posted online in the undergraduate and graduate catalog. Individual course grading policies are communicated in the syllabi. The academic calendars and policies are the same for distance students as for traditional students. This information is disseminated to

distance students via automated email once they register for a course. Appropriate sample support documentation was provided for the consideration of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the University undergraduate and graduate catalogs and websites for the Bursar and the Registrar and met with the University Registrar in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.4** Program length is appropriate for each of the institution's educational programs.
(Program length) New standard 9.2

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that all degree program requirements including number of credits required and program length are published on the institutional website. For all accredited programs, the institution documents that the credit requirements and program length are aligned with accreditation standards and appear to be appropriate and in keeping with commonly accepted practice in higher education.

Undergraduate degree programs are approved by THECB, which sets a minimum requirement of 120 credit hours for completion. The institution has undergraduate degree (B.S.) programs in Biomedical Engineering, Computer Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Software Engineering that exceed 120 credit hours. As required, the institution provided justification for the completion hours for these programs as part of THECB approval.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the University's catalogs and website, and conducted interviews with the University Registrar and the Graduate Dean in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.5** The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints. (See the Commission policy "Complaint Procedures against the Commission or its Accredited Institutions.") **(Student complaints) New standard 12.4**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints using a combination of policies and procedures that are outlined in the "complaint resources sections" of the graduate and undergraduate catalogs. The primary responsibility for dealing with student complaints falls within the Division of Student Affairs and rests with the Dean of Students. The grievance policy and student code of conduct are outlined in university policy. Students are made aware of these policies during various orientation programs. The policies, grievance procedures, and time frames for handling grievances are published and clear. Evidence that the institution follows these procedures was provided through the use of samples.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Office of Undergraduate Education Complaint Log, Office of Graduate Education Complaint Log, Student Affairs Complaint Log 2015-2016, Student Grievances Policy - UTDSP5005, the 2017 Undergraduate Catalog, the 2017 Graduate Catalog and examples of a referral

of grade dispute, a referral of an academic appeal, and a complaint pertaining to Student Appeals on non-grievances. In addition, interviews were conducted with Vice President for Student Affairs, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, and Director of Assessment for Student Affairs, in support of the institution's case for compliance. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.6 Recruitment materials and presentations accurately represent the institution's practices and policies. (Recruitment materials) New standard 10.5**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution uses recruitment materials and presentations that are accurate and consistent with the institution's goals and practices. Wide-ranging samples of recruitment materials were provided for review. The institution has a comprehensive strategy and process for enrollment and recruitment that has received a number of best practice recognitions or awards. Both the Assistant Provost in the Office of Admission and Enrollment and the University Registrar are charged with oversight to ensure that descriptions of admissions standards are current in recruitment materials and in the online undergraduate and graduate catalogs. These administrative officers work closely with the Marketing Office for content delivery, fact checking across publications, ad development, electronic communications and the university website.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Communications Review (2012 – 2015), the website for mass email process, websites for the Office of Admission and Enrollment, the Office of Communications, the Marketing Department, and Web Services, Virtual Campus Tour Website, "Snapshot" Publication, the "UT Dallas Overview" Presentation and conducted interviews with Assistant Provost for the Office of Admission and Enrollment, Director of Freshman Admission and Enrollment, Director of Transfer Admission and Enrollment, Director of Enrollment Technology, and Dean of Graduate Studies in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.7 The institution is in compliance with its program responsibilities under Title IV of the most recent Higher Education Act as amended. (In reviewing the institution's compliance with these program responsibilities, the Commission relies on documentation forwarded to it by the U.S. Department of Education.) (Title IV program responsibilities) New standard 13.6**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution has demonstrated compliance with its Title IV program responsibilities through examples and audits. A copy of the most recent 2016 Texas Statewide Audit was included (period Sept 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015).

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found the institution had demonstrated that its financial aid programs have been audited. The Texas State Auditor's Office performed and audit of student financial aid audit for FY 2016 including Federal Pell Grants and Federal Direct Loans.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee review encompassed a wide variety of documents (over 15) provided by the University of Texas at Dallas including: State of Texas Auditor reports, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Reporting Manuals

and Procedures, Financial Aid Databases, Reconciliation and Reporting procedures, FISAP report, and compliance reports.

During the site visit, the committee reviewed the university's financial aid audits and talk with their financial aid administrative team. The committee met with the Executive Vice President, the Vice President for Budget and Finance, the Associate Vice President and the Director of Financial Aid.

The institution reports that 45% of students received some form of federal or state aid during 2016-2017. Federal aid disbursements totaled more than \$93.6 million, of which federal Pell grants accounted for \$23.1 million and Federal Direct Student Loans \$69.8 million. The State of Texas provided grants and aid of \$49.6 million during this time period.

The fiscal year 2016 audit report, which was finalized in January 2017, noted one instance of non-compliance in relation to reporting. The institution corrected this upon notice and the State Auditor's office completed a follow up review noting partial completion.

In addition, the university submits to the federal government an annual Fiscal Operations Report and Application to Participate (FISAP). The institution has been in good standing has had no limitation or suspensions from the Department of Education.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted interviews in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee

***4.8** An institution that offers distance or correspondence education documents each of the following: **(Distance and correspondence education)**

4.8.1 Demonstrates that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as (a) a secure login and pass code, (b) proctored examinations, or (c) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification. **New standard 10.6a**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution requires every student to set up a secure system ID with password. Instructions are provided to students who must agree to terms of use. In addition to an academic integrity policy, the institution maintains both an academic integrity policy and a policy specific to acceptable use for informational resources. Faculty may elect to use IP address confirmation or in-person proctored examination to verify student ID.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the institution's NetID Password Setup procedures, the Information Resources Acceptable Use Policy, Academic Integrity Policy, and the Center for Student Success Proctored Exam Website and conducted interviews with Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, Senior Director of Administrative and Client Services, Assistant Provost and Director of Educational Technology Services, and Associate Vice President and Controller /Chair of the UT Dallas SACSCOC

Financial and Physical Resources and Information Technology Committee in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

4.8.2 Has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs. **New standard 10.6b**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution adheres to federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) guidelines for all students in traditional and distance-learning programs. The policy is accessible on the institutional website and is published in both the undergraduate and graduate catalogs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the 2017 Undergraduate Policies and Procedures: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 2017 Graduate Policies and Procedures: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the website for the Registrar, and the website for the Office of the Provost, and conducted interviews with Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, Senior Director of Administrative and Client Services, Assistant Provost and Director of Educational Technology Services, and Associate Vice President and Controller /Chair of the UT Dallas SACSCOC Financial and Physical Resources and Information Technology Committee in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

4.8.3 Has a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges associated with verification of student identity. **New standard 10.8c**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution does charge a required fee for identity verification and for proctored exams in some on-line courses. Students are notified automatically upon registering for an on-line course of these fees, and additional information is included in the syllabi for on-line courses which require a proctored exam fee, as well as published on the Student Success Center website.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the website for the Student Success Center related to proctored exams, a copy of a course syllabus, and conducted interviews with Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer, Senior Director of Administrative and Client Services, Assistant Provost and Director of Educational Technology Services, and Associate Vice President and Controller /Chair of the UT Dallas SACSCOC Financial and Physical Resources and Information Technology Committee in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.9** The institution has policies and procedures for determining the credit hours awarded for courses and programs that conform to commonly accepted practices in higher education

and to Commission policy. *(See the Commission policy "Credit Hours.")* **(Definition of credit hours) New standard 10.7**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution's definition of credit hours was developed in accordance with the requirements of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and federal guidelines for all courses. A policy statement is published online as Semester Credit Hour Value (UTDPP1090). Credit hour standards are published for all courses in the Catalog.

New standard 10.7

The institution publishes and implements policies for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for its courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery. These policies require oversight by persons academically qualified to make the necessary judgments. In educational programs not based on credit hours (e.g., direct assessment programs), the institution has a sound means for determining credit equivalencies. **(Policies for awarding credit)**

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed university policy UTDPP1090, in accordance with the Texas Administrative Code, for defining and awarding credit hours (posted online in the UT Dallas Policy Navigator) as well as the Registrar's course inventory resources webpage that provides guidance on academic credit for different modes of teaching. These materials document the roles of academically qualified individuals in making academic judgments. The evidence provided supports the institution's case for compliance.

E. Additional observations regarding strengths and weaknesses of the institution. (optional)

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee experienced difficulty with the user interface including insufficient labeling and broken links, which made the faculty qualifications evaluation process cumbersome and inefficient. For example, there was no way for the Committee to know that a “grumpy cat” icon would contain the faculty roster.

ADDENDUM

2018 New Principles not contained in the 2012 edition of the Principles of Accreditation.

New standard 4.2.g

The governing board defines and regularly evaluates its responsibilities and expectations.
(Board self-evaluation)

This principle is new in 2018, and therefore it was not reviewed by the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed evidence provided by the institution and interviewed (via telephone conference) a member of the Board of Regents, and confirmed that the UT System Board of Regents defines its responsibilities in several official State documents. Section 65.11 of the Texas Education Code (TEC) designates the Board of Regents as the governing body of UT Dallas. Additionally, the UT System Regents' Rules and Regulations outline the governing body's responsibilities.

The institution's governing board also regularly evaluates its responsibilities and expectations. The Regents' Rules and Regulations were amended on February 15, 2018 to explicitly describe the requirement for board self-evaluation on at least a two-year schedule. This amendment is contained in Section 4 of Rule 10101 (Board Authority and Duties) and specifies the evaluator assessments that must take place. In addition to presenting this amendment, the institution provided other documentation indicating that the responsibilities and expectations of the Regents are evaluated on a regular basis. For example, the institution provided copies of Regents' meeting minutes reflecting regular discussion and evaluation of the board's authority and duties, including the role of the board officers.

New standard 12.6

The institution provides information and guidance to help student borrowers understand how to manage their debt and repay their loans. **(Student debt)**

The University of Texas at Dallas reports that 45% of students received some form of federal or state aid during 2016-2017. Federal aid disbursements totaled more than \$93.6 million, of which Federal Direct Student Loans accounted for \$69.8 million.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed UTD's web-based tools and other information it provides to students and their families regarding how to manage their debt. The review encompassed a wide variety of documents (over 30) provided by the University of Texas at Dallas including: United States Department of Education Financial Aid Shopping Sheet, US Department of Education Reports, 2018-2019 University of Texas at Dallas financial aid shopping sheet sample, Scorecards, Student Success Tip Sheets, Orientation Information, Materials from the State of Texas Legislature, Cash Courses, and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board reports.

The On-Site Reaffirmation committee discussed a wide variety of financial aid issues with the institution's Finance and Student Financial Aid team. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with the Executive Vice President, Vice President for Budget and Finance, Associate Vice President and Controller and the Director of Financial Aid.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted the following:

- According to the College Scorecard, 64% of UT Dallas students typically pay down

their debt, compared to the national average of 47%.

- According to the College Scorecard, around 50% of the University of Texas at Dallas students receive a loan.
- According to the College Scorecard, the average amount of loans upon graduation is \$18,750.
- The Department of Education loan default rate was dropped to 4%, only 128 students are currently in default.
- The University of Texas at Dallas Success Center provides a seminar entitled Comet Cents to inform students about their Financial Success Programs.
- Comet Cents activities are also included as part of their QEP initiatives and further dedication to student success.
- The Jindal School of Management's MBA was recently recognized by US News and World Report Top 10 Short List comparing average starting salaries of MBA graduates to their student loan debt.
- The Career Center provides students with information about their major, school, UT Dallas and potential career.
- Last year, the Princeton Review ranked the University of Texas at Dallas amongst the best colleges that pay you back.

Documentation and interviews provided by the University of Texas at Dallas confirms that the institution has proactive policies, procedures, and tools to assist students and their families to understand how to manage their debt and make well informed decisions regarding financial aid.

Part III. Assessment of the Quality Enhancement Plan

A. Brief description of the institution's Quality Enhancement Plan

The University of Texas at Dallas (UTD) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is titled, "Orbit: Keeping New Comets on Course." This plan focuses on creating an institutional environment that supports the transition and success of all students who are new to the university, specifically first time in college (FTIC) or first-year students, transfer students, international students, and graduate students. The following three interventions have been identified to support these students in their initial transition to the university: 1) seminars (mandatory for both first-year and transfer students); 2) peer mentoring; and 3) program supports that include a range of campus events and activities, as well as student services.

An overarching goal of the Orbit program is to foster student engagement and sense of belonging in the four distinct and "new to UTD" student populations, which the university views as pathways to increase student persistence. Through a process that engaged faculty, staff, and students in the QEP topic identification, selection, and development, and drew on and from research and best practice literature, institutional data, institutional mission, vision, and existing efforts at the university, the QEP Development Team identified the specific focus for the proposed project.

B. Analysis of the Quality Enhancement Plan

A. **Topic Identification.** *The institution has a topic identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes.*

The QEP describes a topic that has been identified from within the institution's comprehensive planning process and focuses on continuous improvement related to student success.

B. **Broad-based Support.** *The plan has the broad-based support of institutional constituencies.*

The QEP has broad-based support of institutional constituencies, as demonstrated by the involvement of various faculty, students, and staff, including those who work directly with the various populations identified in the focus of the QEP, in the planning and development of the QEP. Additionally, the QEP proposal articulates the continued broad involvement in the implementation process.

C. **Focus of the Plan.** *The institution identifies a significant issue that focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success.*

The university has chosen a QEP that is largely focused on student success, which the university has determined will include improvements in student sense of belonging and engagement, and in turn, persistence rates. While the institution has identified and articulated goals related to first-year student participation in the QEP, they have not done the same for the other populations (transfer students, international students, and graduate students).

D. **Institutional Capability for the Initiation, Implementation, and Completion of the Plan.** *The institution provides evidence that it has committed sufficient resources to initiate, implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.*

The institution has not identified sufficient institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP. While the budget is included in the plan, it lacks specific and detailed information about the existing and new resources necessary to implement the QEP. Additionally, a plan for seminar faculty recruitment, training, and on-going development should be developed.

E. **Assessment of the Plan.** *The institution has developed an appropriate plan to assess achievement.*

The QEP proposal includes a plan for assessment, but the plan does not articulate specific goals or targets that would help the institution determine the success of the QEP, and in particular, specific goals related to sense of belonging, engagement, and persistence for each of the four distinct populations involved in the QEP.

C. **Analysis and Comments for Strengthening the QEP**

The focus on creating an institutional environment that will support success by fostering the belonging, engagement, and persistence of all new UTD students is an admirable goal, yet exceptionally broad given the diverse needs and number of new students the university enrolls in each of the four distinct populations that comprise the larger population of new UTD students.

Moving forward, it is suggested that the Development Committee gather institutional data, specific to each of the four populations involved in the QEP, to determine unique persistence and student success targets for each population. In that process, they may want to consider the extent to which the various components of the QEP could and should be customized to meet the nuanced needs of the students (e.g., What unique course content or approaches will be used in the transfer student seminar? What features will be unique to each of the student population specific mentoring programs?). Similarly, the evaluation of institutional data, as well as research and best practice literature focused on the development and transition of the specific populations identified for the QEP, may help the committee consider the focus, scope, and approach of the QEP. While all new students may potentially benefit in some way from the types of interventions described in the QEP, the scope of the project may be too broad to be executed within the allotted timeframe. Narrowing the focus of the QEP could allow the institution to take a more intentional approach while identifying institutional best practices that may be adapted and applied to other student populations and/or points of student transition.

Finally, in conversations with faculty, staff, and students it became obvious that many of the individual components of the proposed QEP could be strengthened to ensure they are responsive to the unique needs of the various student populations. For example, the recommended components for both the first-year seminar and transfer student seminar, described in the QEP proposal, are virtually identical and the transfer seminar curriculum includes topics that are addressed in the face-to-face portion of the required transfer orientation program. Additionally, the introduction to and inclusion of experiential learning activities offered at UTD (e.g., internships, study abroad, undergraduate research, etc.) could enhance the content in the first-year and transfer student seminars while contributing to the overarching goals related to persistence, belonging, and engagement.

Part IV. Third-Party Comments

If an institution receives Third-Party Comments, the institution has an opportunity to respond to those comments and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviews the response as part of its comprehensive evaluation of the institution.

The Committee should check one of the following:

☒ No Third-Party Comments submitted.

☐ Third-Party Comments submitted. (**Address the items below.**)

1. *Describe the nature of the Comments and any allegations of non-compliance that may have been part of the formal Third-Party Comments;*

2. *Indicate whether the Committee found evidence in support of any allegations of non-compliance.*

If found to be out of compliance, the Committee should write a recommendation and include it in Part II under the standard cited with a full narrative that describes why the institution was found to be out of compliance and the documentation that supports that determination. In this space, reference the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement and the recommendation number cited in Part II.

If determined to be in compliance, explain in this space the reasons and refer to the documentation in support of this finding.

APPENDIX A

Roster of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee

Dr. Michael G. Levitzky - **CHAIR**
Professor of Physiology
LSU School of Medicine
New Orleans, Louisiana

Dr. Cynthia Margaret Bauerle
Dean, College of Science and Mathematics
James Madison University
Harrisonburg, Virginia

Dr. William F. Bina
Dean, Savannah Campus, School of Medicine
Mercer University
Savannah, Georgia

Dr. Jerry Clark
Chief Student Affairs Officer
University of Mississippi Medical Center
Jackson, Mississippi

Dr. Mary Angela Coleman
Associate VP Institutional Effectiveness
University of South Alabama
Mobile, Alabama

Dr. Lori S. Gonzalez
Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty and
Student Affairs
University of Tennessee Health Science Center
Memphis, Tennessee

Mr. Tim L. Hodge
Assistant Vice President, Budget & Financial
Planning
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

Dean Theresa Liedtka
Dean of the Lupton Library
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

Dr. Mark Sothmann
Provost Emeritus
Medical University of South Carolina
Charleston, South Carolina

SACSCOC Staff Coordinator

Dr. Barry Goldstein
Vice President
SACS Commission on Colleges
Decatur, Georgia

Roster of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee

Dr. J. Alan Boyette - **CHAIR**
Senior Vice Provost
UNC Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina

Dr. James Milton Adams
Senior Vice Provost (Retired)
Professor of Biomedical Engineering
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Mr. Kyle Clark
Vice President for Finance & Administration
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Dr. Lynne S. Crosby
Vice Provost/Associate Vice President for
Academic Affairs
Austin Peay State University
Clarksville, Tennessee

Dr. Jane M. Kinney
Professor of English & Coordinator of
Faculty Credentials
Valdosta State University
Valdosta, Georgia

Dr. Eric J. Summers
Vice President for Student Affairs
Southeastern Louisiana University
Hammond, Louisiana

Dr. S. David Wu
Provost and Executive Vice President
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

QEP Evaluator

Dr. Stephanie M. Foote
Assistant Vice President, Teaching,
Learning, and Evidence-Based Practices
John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in
Undergraduate Education
Brevard, NC

Staff Representative

Dr. Crystal A. Baird
Vice President
SACS Commission on Colleges
Decatur, GA

APPENDIX B

Off-Campus Sites or Distance Learning Programs Reviewed

University of Texas at Dallas Off-Campus Instructional Site

Callier Center for Communication Disorders Dallas, Texas

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee members toured the Callier Center and interviewed the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, the Executive Director, library staff, faculty and students on March 5, 2018. The Callier Center for Communication Disorders is located at 1966 Inwood Road, Dallas, TX 75235. The Callier Center was established in 1969. UTD offers the following programs at the Callier Center:

- MS Communication Disorders with 220 students
- PhD Communication Sciences and Disorders with 30 students
- AuD Audiology with 50 students

As of fall 2016, 25 full-time faculty members teach in the MS Communication Disorders MS program. Nine (9) full-time faculty members teach in the PhD Communication Sciences and Disorders program. Eight (8) full-time faculty members teach in the Audiology program. The faculty at the Callier Center are considered full-time faculty at UTD, regardless of location of instruction. Many of the faculty teach and have offices at both the Callier Center and the UTD Richardson Campus. The faculty and programs are expected to adhere to University procedures and processes, such as program assessment, teaching load, retention/tenure/ promotion, and faculty evaluation processes. Faculty can participate in UTD Richardson campus meetings and activities through streaming, WebEx, and other web conferencing or simulcast technology.

There are two primary administrators responsible for the university's activities at the Callier Center, including the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies within the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences and the Executive Director of the Center. The Associate Dean, the lead academic officer at the Center, holds a PhD in Psychology and has worked at the Callier Center since it was established in 1969. The Associate Dean reports to the Dean of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences. The Executive Director of the Callier Center holds a PhD in Communication Disorders and also serves as a faculty member in the Communication Sciences and Disorders program. The Executive Director is responsible for the Center's facilities, clinical opportunities, leadership of the on-site pre-school (which serves 220 children), fundraising, and support of the Callier Center foundation board. The Executive Director also reports to the Dean of the School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences. UTD appears to provide adequate personnel resources to operate the programs and services at the Callier Center. Administrative staff appear to work collaboratively to achieve the Center's teaching, research, and service missions.

The Callier Center consists of eight buildings (100,570 GSF) and is located on 5.5 acres adjacent to The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (UT Southwestern) in the city of Dallas. The Callier Center houses 4 classrooms and 13 research labs. UTD added a new wing to the Center, which houses state of the art clinical labs and space for clinical services to the public. Research and clinical labs are separated from the clinical services space, in order to provide patient information. The Center contains new equipment for testing patients' hearing and diagnosis of speech language abilities. The Center has installed an elevator and wheelchair ramp to provide accessible space. Faculty also utilize instructional technology for teaching students at the Callier Center and the UTD Richardson Campus.

The Callier Center has a wireless network, on-site technical staff, and classrooms with computer and projection equipment. The physical facilities appear to be adequate to support the scope of the programs and services offered at the site.

The University provides full-time library staff at the Center's library, which is open Monday through Friday, 9am-1pm, 2pm-6pm. The Callier Center librarian holds a Master of Library Science degree. The library collection includes books, eBooks, and 375 electronic databases curated specifically for the Center's academic programs. The library also provides diagnostic collection assessment tools for students. The library staff can also borrow library materials from the UTD Richardson campus library upon request.

The Callier Center appears to be safe, secure, and well-resourced in terms of facilities and services. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee interviewed students who reported feeling safe at the Center, and were aware of the security personnel stationed in the Center's lobby. Graduate students and Callier Center faculty and staff must wear identification badges to utilize the facilities and access research and clinical lab space. UTD reported no incidents in the 2015 Annual Security Report and Fire Safety Report and one incident at the Center in the 2016 Annual Security Report and Fire Safety Report.

The faculty expressed satisfaction with the budgetary, physical, and personnel resources available at the site. Faculty indicated that they can access annual faculty grants to support research and program heads can seek additional funding to meet needs.

Students expressed satisfaction with the academic and student support at the Callier Center. Students are assigned advisors who can assist and or refer students to the appropriate personnel for support. Students are encouraged to contact their advisor if they have any concerns, although students are welcome to contact any Callier Center faculty member or administrator to resolve concerns or complaints. Students are expected to follow the Student Complaint Resources procedures published in the UTD Graduate Catalog, including class registration and withdrawals, grades, and tuition and financial aid.

University of Texas at Dallas Off-Campus Instructional Site

Collin Higher Education Center McKinney, Texas

Classes began at the Collin Higher Education Center (CHEC) in January of 2010. Located at 3452 Spur 399 in McKinney, Texas, CHEC is operated by Collin College and houses five partners: Texas A&M University-Commerce, Texas Woman's University, Texas Tech University, University of North Texas, and University of Texas at Dallas (UT Dallas). A master memorandum of understanding governs the partnership and clearly articulates the duties, responsibilities, and opportunities for all partners. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee visited the location on March 5, 2018. The committee toured the facility and conducted interviews with the Assistant Provost and SACSCOC Liaison and Administrative Liaison to CHEC, the Academic Advisor at CHEC, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, the Senior Associate Dean for Graduate Programs at the Naveen Jindal School of Management, the Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs at the Naveen Jindal School of Management, and the Director of Advising for the Naveen Jindal School of Management, as well as faculty, and students.

The University of Texas at Dallas' Jindal School of Management offers courses that lead to baccalaureate degrees in Accounting, Business Administration, and master's degrees in Accounting and Business Administration at the CHEC. The courses offered are taught by full-time UT Dallas faculty utilizing the same books and curriculum as courses offered on the main campus in Richardson. Student learning outcomes and assessments for each degree program are the same regardless of course delivery location. The courses assigned to faculty at CHEC are part of their regular teaching workload. In the spring 2018 eight courses (8) were offered at CHEC.

CHEC provides a convenient location for students that work during the day and choose to take evening classes. Students usually take classes at CHEC in conjunction with courses on the main campus. In spring 2018, the university had 223 students enrolled for coursework. Of the 223 students, 209 enrolled in classes at both CHEC and the main campus in Richardson. One full-time administrative support personnel is available for students that take courses at CHEC, which is adequate given the number of the students served at the location. Students indicate that they select to take courses at CHEC as a matter of convenience due work and family commitments, smaller class size, and a high level of support of students with individual advising and assistance.

Resources made available for students are decentralized. Most student resources are provided by the institution at the main campus in Richardson. Students taking classes at CHEC have full access to the wide variety of resources that are offered at the main campus even though they are taking classes at a different location. On location, CHEC offers computer labs, study areas, faculty office space, and a break room with food and supply vending. On campus security, maintenance, and technical support for CHEC is provided by Collin College. UT Dallas provides library resources electronically.

Collin College charges UT Dallas a \$25 per credit hour fee for use of the facility. Students enrolled in courses at CHEC pay an additional \$80 per credit hour each semester. The university's budget for CHEC operations was \$107,348 for the 2017 fiscal year. Total expenses for 2017 amounted to \$84,058.

APPENDIX C

List of Recommendations Cited in the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee

CR 3.3.2 (1) New standard 7.2d, (Commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP), CR 3.3.2 (3) New standard 7.2e (Plan to assess achievement) Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends the institution develop a Quality Enhancement Plan that commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP and includes a plan to assess achievement.

CS 3.4.4 New standard 10.8 (Evaluating and awarding academic credit)
Recommendation 2

Recommendation 2: Principle 10.8, Evaluating and awarding academic credit:

The Committee recommends that the institution publish policies for evaluating and awarding credit for non-credit coursework not originating from the institution. Through this policy, the institution is expected to (a) ensure the quality of any credit or coursework recorded on its transcript, (b) ensure an approval process with oversight by persons academically qualified to make the necessary judgments, and (c) ensure that the credit awarded is comparable to a designated credit experience and is consistent with the institution's mission.