

DOCUMENTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

**ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES
OF THE GENERAL FACULTY FOR 2004-2005**

The annual reports of the standing committees of the General Faculty for 2004-2005 received to date are reproduced below.

Sue Alexander Greninger, Secretary
The Faculty Council

**ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES
OF THE GENERAL FACULTY FOR 2004-2005****A. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEES****A-1 Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility**

The 2004-05 Committee of Counsel for Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR) functioned actively on a variety of topics. The major activities, results of those activities, and resultant committee suggestions focused on: Course Instructor Survey (CIS) Processes, Faculty Tenure Process Procedural Reviews, and Changes in the CCAFR Description and Composition.

Course Instructor Survey (CIS) Processes

During the fall, the provost and Faculty Council chair requested that the CCAFR review “all issues concerning the new legal status of the Course Instructor Surveys” in light of the ruling that all course instructor information is owned by the University. This ruling raised issues around the process of reporting CIS results to the faculty, especially concerning handwritten student comments (given Freedom of Information and FERPA issues). After discussing the issues and later meeting with Dr. Chuck Gaede, Interim Director of the Measurement and Evaluation Center, the CCAFR decided that the scope of issues was substantial and recommended that an *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Council be appointed. This recommendation was passed by the Faculty Council in spring, and such committee was appointed by the Faculty Council chair.

In spite of the recommendation that an *ad hoc* committee further review the issues, the CCAFR did undertake its own review and makes the following observations and recommendations for this report.

- The committee is concerned about written student CIS comments being used for faculty evaluation (especially negatively) without the faculty’s knowledge and opportunity to refute potentially false and liable statements. Previously, when the faculty held the original student written comments, they would know when and how those comments were being used, as they would be the providers. Without knowledge that the written comments are being used for evaluation, faculty cannot respond to a particular student comment.
- There is also concern about the variation in practices across campus for returning CIS documents to faculty for review. Some colleges are keeping the originals and providing scanned copies to the faculty. There is concern about the readability of the electronic copies of the student’s written comments. Some faculty are unable to read those comments at all, resulting in their not being able to know what students have said in their comments.

Other comments and issues raised by the CCAFR during its consideration of the CIS ruling implications can be found in the motion for the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee made on behalf of the committee at the February 2005, Faculty Council meeting (D 3778-3786).

Faculty Promotion Process Procedural Reviews

The Committee of Counsel for Academic Freedom and Responsibility is charged with responding to faculty requests for procedural review of their promotion decision process. The CCAFR received several inquiries this year and two such requests which were conducted by two separate committees and later combined. These reviews were conducted during December 2004, and January 2005, with a report submitted. As a result of this process and the committee's experiences with it, we have several comments and recommendations which are neither independent nor mutually exclusive.

- Appropriate CCAFR Focus Is on Academic Freedom Issues and Major University Policy Violations—The CCAFR cannot be a full-investigation body for promotion procedure reviews, especially during a holiday semester break, but not at any time of year. The CCAFR review should focus on academic freedom issues, not potentially wider grievance issues. This fall, the Grievance Committee was not taking new cases to the full committee (beyond chair involvement), but this is generally not the case. The CCAFR's role should be to identify major violations of University policy within its area of responsibility. Policy is needed to clearly define what resources exist for faculty-requested promotion review purposes and differences in scope for those resources made explicit (e.g., the ombudsman, grievance committee, or the CCAFR in extraordinary situations when a process is allegedly an academic freedom violation).
- Visible University Ombudsman—The University ombudsman presence should continue to be made very visible. Possibly, the University ombudsman should be the first person contacted by a faculty member seeking review of their promotion process. The CCAFR should be a resource used if the ombudsman (or grievance committee) needs to refer a larger policy question of academic freedom for exploration, while addressing the legitimacy of the particular complaint at other levels.
- Allow Pre-Presidential Decision Review by the CCAFR—The committee believes that the University should revise the current timing guidelines so that procedural issues can be addressed prior to the president rendering a “final promotion decision.” Currently, at least for faculty initiated review, the CCAFR is to submit its report only after the president has rendered a decision. To avoid further academic freedom/procedural process deviations, if any, it would be useful to allow the CCAFR to report as early as after a departmental vote and before the dean renders a decision. Thus, we believe the University should revise the current stated guidelines from this perspective and allow for the CCAFR review at any stage in the promotion process when broader academic freedom issues are involved.
- Increase University-wide Awareness of Existing Promotion and Tenure Review Guidelines Very Early Each Year—While there are University guidelines for promotion and tenure review in place, they may not be well-known by all faculty and administrators. In addition to the faculty being considered for review, the department chairs and deans should be reminded each year very explicitly what the University promotion and tenure review process guidelines are. We recommend improved communications at all levels of administration within the colleges and University wide, so as to make certain the University promotion and tenure review processes are followed. This communication should occur very early in the pre-process, probably in the spring, when some departments begin to send out for external references to ensure that the University guidelines are well-known by faculty and administrators prior to the inception of the decision process.
- Develop Summary Version of University Promotion and Tenure Review Guidelines—We recommend that there be a “short, summary version” of the University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Review to serve as a “quick reference” and readily visible tool. We suggest that the provost appoint a committee that includes the ombudsman and the chair of the grievance committee to develop a shorter document of the promotion and tenure guidelines for faculty and administrators to use. Summarizing the rules in this way may be helpful in stimulating awareness and adherence to them, in spite of the fact that they are currently listed on the provost's Web site. In short, we are suggesting an “information push” (v. “information pull”) strategy to increase ease of awareness of the guidelines and ease of adherence across campus. This is not to replace the college responsibility for providing the information to departments, but meant to enhance other processes already in existence.

Changes in the CCAFR Description and Composition

The Committee on Committees asked that we review our current description and composition. Following that review, we made several recommended changes, which were approved by the Committee on Committees and the Faculty Council. These are summarized below.

- Include the provost in the list of people who can request a promotion process review from the CCAFR. This exclusion might have resulted historically from the fact that the University did not always have a provost.
- A law professor should always be on the committee, and the guidelines should reflect that one be appointed, if no law professor has been elected. This recommendation is due to the legal nature of some of the issues that might come before the CCAFR each year.
- Assistant deans should be explicitly excluded from membership on the CCAFR. This was to avoid a high potential for conflict of interest.

We discussed excluding assistant department chairs from membership on the CCAFR, but did not so recommend, as the University does not currently code that position, and responsibilities vary widely across campus. Thus, not wanting to limit academic freedom, we did not explicitly exclude this administrative title from the CCAFR's membership intentionally and after due consideration. This does not mean that someone in that position could not decline to serve, if there were concern for a conflict of interest due to their job description or for other reasons.

Linda L. Golden, chair

A-2 Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets

The Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets serves in an advisory capacity to the president and provost. Its charge is to review University budgets and make appropriate recommendations.

The Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets (FACB) met five times in the course of the 2004-05 academic year. Although the committee brought no resolutions to the Faculty Council, the meetings, which were characterized by frank, open, and productive discussions, represented valuable opportunities for the FACB to make known to the administration faculty perspectives on numerous budgetary issues.

The first meeting (October 18, 2004) began with "Budget 101," a crash course on the UT budget delivered by Executive Vice Provost Steve Monti. Its purpose was to bring members of the FACB up to speed on both the general structure of the budget and the annual budget formation process. During the last part of the meeting, Provost Sheldon Ekland-Olson briefly outlined the administration's budgetary priorities for 2004-05. At the top of the list were two items: (1) funding at least a 3% raise for faculty and staff and (2) maintaining in aggressive mode President Faulkner's faculty expansion initiative. Discussion of the various priorities was put off until the next meeting.

The second FACB meeting (November 22, 2004) was devoted to two topics: (a) the report of the 2004-05 Tuition Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) and its budgetary implications and (b) a detailed discussion of the administration's budget priorities. The element of the TPAC's report that elicited the most discussion was the recommendation that the University adopt a college-dependent, flat-rate tuition structure (based on a 15-hour course load) for all UT undergraduates. A particular item of interest was the impact this change would have on the University's fee structure, since under the proposed model most fees would be folded into the flat-rate tuition. [The UT-System Board of Regents ultimately approved the bulk of the TPAC's recommendations, with one significant change: the base course load for the flat-rate was lowered from fifteen to fourteen hours. The budgetary consequence of this change will be the loss of roughly \$5M in revenue for 2005-06.] The second half of the meeting was a free-flowing dialogue on the budget priorities that the provost had presented in the October meeting. The provost described how attempts to address the stated priorities might fare under several scenarios, ranging from the rosy to the grim, that might play themselves out against the backdrop of the legislative session. He then turned the tables on the committee and asked: Suppose that you were in my place and were confronted

with a disappointing outcome in the Legislature with respect to higher education funding, one that forced you to choose between a raise for current faculty and continuation of the faculty expansion program. What would you do? And what concrete measures would you recommend for the reallocation of institutional resources so as to allow the administration to address budgetary issues (especially issues surrounding faculty and staff salaries) more effectively in both the short term and the long term? The meeting ended with a charge to the committee to ponder these questions.

The third meeting of the FACB (January 31, 2005) dealt almost entirely with the two questions the provost had posed in the November FACB meeting. On the first of these there was plenty of give-and-take on the “keeping the home folks happy” versus “bringing in the new blood” issue. In the end, the committee reached consensus that the faculty expansion initiative was sufficiently important that using a portion of the faculty raise pool to keep it afloat would be in the best interest of the University, but that asking the faculty to forego a raise entirely in order to fund faculty expansion would have a demoralizing effect. The committee’s suggestions in response to the provost’s second question were less satisfactory. Although a number of ideas for reallocation of resources were put forth, most were either impractical or involved hidden costs. This issue is plainly one with which the FACB will have to wrestle for years to come. At the meeting the committee also endorsed two proposals that it was asked to consider by the University Budget Council: the first was a proposal to adjust the University’s ORP contributions for newer faculty in order to bring them in line with the level of contributions received by faculty who were already at UT when a change in state policy temporarily caused a discrepancy in the contribution rates to arise; the second was a proposal to increase the level of the “standard” raises that faculty receive in conjunction with significant promotions (assistant professor to associate professor, associate professor to professor, lecture to senior lecturer).

At its fourth meeting (April 4, 2005) the FACB was given a detailed report on the results of the “We’re Texas” capital campaign by Vice President and CFO Kevin Hegarty and Rick Eason, the new vice president for development. Eason gave hints about possible future directions for development efforts, but he did not get into specifics. Committee members made a number of suggestions for Eason to consider, among them the following two: (a) that greater emphasis be placed on raising money for graduate fellowships and (b) that faculty be invited to play a more active role in the development enterprise, especially after a potential donor has been identified and the University is attempting to convince him or her of a gift’s concrete impact at the department or program level. Eason seemed quite amenable to both suggestions, although he stressed the difficulty of selling donors on the value (in particular, the PR value for the donor) of graduate fellowships.

The final meeting of the FACB took place on May 16, 2005. The main objective of this meeting was to update the committee on the happenings at the Legislature, which was at the time of the meeting approaching conference committee deliberation of a number of bills that relate directly to higher education budgets. A couple of other matters were discussed at some length. The first pertained to a strategy for maintaining a salary balance among a department’s “elite” faculty (i.e., those most vulnerable to outside offers from prestigious institutions) by allowing salary adjustments to be made for such individuals at the time when a new faculty member of the same stature is hired at a higher salary. The provost would oversee a pool of funds that could aid a department in forestalling attacks on its star faculty by preemptive salary adjustments in the circumstances indicated (rationale: it makes little sense to hire National Academy member X if Nobel Laureate Y and MacArthur Fellow Z are lost in the process). The committee was sympathetic to this proposal, at the same time expressing hope that a mechanism could be found to address the broader issue of salary compression. The committee also discussed the merits of doing some raises for 2005-06 on a deferred basis (say, doing staff raises in the fall, faculty raises in the spring) if the outcome of the legislative session leaves the University with a greater than anticipated budgetary shortfall. Steve Monti explained how the deferred-raise strategy would help to relieve certain budgetary pressures. Again, the committee was supportive of doing this if circumstances dictate.

Bruce Palka, chair

A-3 Faculty Committee on Committees

Members:

Lawrence D. Abraham (chair), professor, kinesiology and health education, and curriculum and instruction

Katherine M. Arens, professor, Germanic studies
 David G. Bogard, professor, mechanical engineering
 Richard A. Cherwitz, professor, communication studies
 Austin M. Gleeson, professor, physics
 Linda L. Golden, professor, marketing administration
 Edmund (Ted) Gordon, associate professor, anthropology
 Sue A. Greninger, *ex officio*, secretary, General Faculty, and associate professor, human ecology
 Linda J. Hayes (vice chair), professor, aerospace engineering and engineering mechanics
 Judith A. Jellison, professor, music
 Robert C. Koons, professor, philosophy
 Angela Valenzuela, associate professor, curriculum and instruction

The Committee on Committees met six times throughout the 2004-05 academic year. The first meeting was convened by Professor Koons on September 8, 2004. At that meeting Professor Abraham was elected to serve as chair and Professor Hayes was elected to serve as co-chair. Professor Bogard, who served as chair in 2003-04, reviewed the previous year's report and described committee business carried forward to the current year. This work primarily consisted of considering requests for increasing student (especially graduate student) and staff representation on certain standing committees. The committee decided to request advice from the Faculty Council Executive Committee and the University administration regarding the issue of increased, perhaps equal, representation of faculty, students, and staff on the standing committees. The committee was not in favor of equal representation, as the majority of members present felt that the current committee structure was designed to support faculty governance. In addition, the committee decided to confirm with the new leaders of the Student Government, the Senate of College Councils, and the Graduate Student Assembly that they were in agreement about selection of student representatives on standing committees.

In October, Professor Linda Reichl, chair of the Faculty Council, referred several new issues for consideration by the committee: length of terms of appointment to standing committees, term limits for service on standing committees, and changes in mission and title of some committees. The committee met on November 12 to consider these issues. In preparation, the chairs of all standing committees were surveyed for reports on current practice and suggestions for modifications in committee composition. However most committee responses were not received in time for this meeting, and so action was postponed. The committee did take action supporting a recommended change in name for Standing Committee C-12 and modifying a suggested change for Standing Committee C-7.

At the January 24 meeting of the Faculty Council, a motion was made from the committee to limit eligibility for election or appointment to a standing committee to individuals who had fewer than four consecutive years of service. The motion was discussed and scheduled for a vote at the February meeting. At the same meeting, a motion to create a new standing committee addressing issues of information technology was referred to the committee.

The committee met on February 4 to discuss the continuing issues related to standing committee composition as well as new business. Recommendations were made for several committees, namely changing the composition (adding staff or student members, especially graduate student members). The motion referred by the Faculty Council to establish a new committee on information technology was supported. A motion was also passed to change the timing of election of standing committee chairs from the first fall meeting to early in the preceding spring semester.

The committee met on March 9 to begin the process of nominating faculty representatives to serve on standing committees. Names were suggested for fifteen committees.

At the March 21 meeting of the Faculty Council, the list of suggested changes to standing committees was entered as new business, to be discussed and voted on at the April meeting. The motion to change the timing of electing standing committee chairs was also made and carried forward for a vote at the April meeting. At the April 11 meeting of the Faculty Council, both motions passed.

The committee met April 22 to complete its work of generating a list of faculty nominees for the standing

committees in the 2005-06 academic year. A list was completed designating the specified number of names for each committee and forwarded to the Office of the General Faculty.

Looking forward to the next academic year, there are no specific issues or unfinished business being carried forward. However the committee could review the issue of student representation on standing committees, paying particular attention to representation of graduate students, for committees not reviewed in the 2004-05 year. The committee chair should also remind the leadership of the Faculty Council about the new procedures for electing committee chairs.

Larry Abraham, chair

A-4 Faculty Grievance Committee

One might paraphrase novelist Charles Dickens in describing the work of this year's Grievance Committee: "It has been the worst of times; it has been the best of times." Formal grievance procedures were suspended but Professor Stan Roux (molecular biology) was appointed to the newly created position of ombudsman and, with hard work and good faith on the part of both administrators and faculty, many of the issues that have troubled the grievance procedure over the last six years are being resolved.

The Grievance Committee suspended its formal grievance procedures in September 2004, arguing that numerous obstacles prevented the efficient and effective enactment of the grievance process. In voting to suspend, this year's Grievance Committee was following a recommendation of the 2003-04 Grievance Committee. The committee pointed to five major issues of concern in coming to their decision:

1. Faculty control of grievance procedure;
2. Cooperation of those against whom a grievance has been filed;
3. Follow-up procedures to enforce hearing panel recommendations;
4. Approval of Faculty Council legislation on disciplining;
5. Approval of Faculty Council legislation on discovery.

Over the course of the year, we believe we have successfully addressed the first three issues. President Faulkner and Provost Ekland-Olson recognized the concern the committee had with the appearance of administrative interference in a faculty procedure. It was suggested that, in future, the president and provost's office should refrain from intervening in the procedures until the hearing panel forwarded their recommendations to them. Both the president and the provost acknowledged the importance of cooperation from those against whom a grievance has been filed and agreed to encourage attendance at hearing panels. Moreover, the provost's office will send a representative to attend the Hearing should the person grieved against be unwilling to attend. The provost furthermore volunteered to report to the Grievance Committee each semester on actions taken to implement the recommendations of the hearing panel, and the Faculty Council approved this action in February 2005.

The two remaining issues—legislation on discovery and disciplining—are still awaiting final approval from the president. In this, we find ourselves in the same position as we were a year ago when the May 2004 Faculty Council approved these two pieces of legislation, which remained unsigned by the president. After lengthy negotiations with the administration, the Grievance Committee submitted revised versions of these *HOP* 3.18 guidelines to the Faculty Council, which approved them unanimously (discovery in February and disciplining in March 2005). We are optimistic that, having secured the agreement of the administration in advance of proposing the legislation to the Faculty Council, these two documents will be expeditiously signed by the president—at which point, the Grievance Committee will re-instate the formal grievance procedures.

We are also optimistic that the Faculty Council will be able to approve a revised version of the *HOP* guidelines on Graduate Student Employee Grievance Procedures (4.03) at its first meeting in September 2005. This revised version will bring graduate student procedures into close compliance with the faculty process.

This year Professor Stan Roux was appointed as University ombudsman, and we believe that Professor Roux has successfully mediated many of the cases that would otherwise have come to the Grievance Committee. The

concern felt by some members of the Faculty Council that the Grievance Committee might be jeopardizing the rights of faculty members in suspending the formal grievance procedures seems not to have been justified as no faculty member proceeded beyond the mediations proposed by the ombudsman.

While no new grievances came to the committee in the AY 2004-05, three grievances remained from the previous year. Of those three, two grievances have proceeded to a hearing panel. In the first case, the hearing panel upheld part of the grievant's position; in the second case, the hearing panel rejected the grievant's complaint, the grievant appealed to the president, who rejected the appeal. The third case will be heard in early May.

I would like to extend my deepest appreciation to my colleagues on the committee whose support, encouragement and energy has transformed this year from an “annus horribilis” to an “annus mirabilis:” Pascale Bos (Germanic languages) Neal Burns (advertising), Alan Friedman (English), Martha Hilley (music), Joni Jones (theatre and dance), Nancy Kwallek (architecture), Desmond Lawler (civil engineering), Paula Murray (management science and information systems), Alba Ortiz (special education), Elizabeth Richmond-Garza (English), Lorenzo Sadun (mathematics), Diane Schallert (educational psychology) Janet Staiger (RTF), Mary Steinhardt (kinesiology and health education), and Karen Wilkins (RTF).

Susan Sage Heinzelman, chair

A-5 Faculty Welfare Committee

Committee Members

Elizabeth Abel, nursing
 Patrick Brocket, management science and information systems
 Wallace Fowler, aerospace engineering and engineering mechanics
 Hillary Hart, civil engineering
 Julia Mickenberg American studies
 Joan Neuberger, history
 John Sampson, law

Faculty Council Appointees

Douglas Burger, computer sciences
 Martha Hilley, music

The full committee met six times during the 2004-05 year. The schedule and the issues discussed were the following:

September 2, 2004

Martha Hilley convened the committee. Hillary Hart was elected chair.

October 1, 2004

Benefits, primarily health—committee wanted to follow up on the previous surveys developed by Mark Alpert (former chair of faculty welfare) and administered with the help of Kyle Kavanaugh. Since Professor Alpert would not be administering the survey again, decision was to postpone any action on this item.

Modified Instructional Duties' Policy—two members wanted to survey departments to see whether this policy is being used and how.

Langlois Report on Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty—decision to follow up on this with provost.

Faculty Travel Grants—These are scandalously low at UT. Two members offered to survey peer institutions.

October 28, 2004

Met with Charles Roeckle, deputy to the president, to discuss the recommendations and language of the Langlois report. Decision made to act on penultimate recommendation of report and set up an implementation committee. As a first step, committee agreed to meet with Provost Ekland-Olson to assess administrative support for report's recommendations and for suggestions on membership of implementation committee.

November 30, 2004

Planning meeting for subsequent meeting with provost.

December 1, 2004

Met with Provost Ekland-Olson to walk through the Langlois report and determine which items were actually already being done, which could be done through policy memos from the provost's office, and which were likely to be somewhat controversial (in spite of the report's having been accepted by the Faculty Council on March 17, 2003). Suggestions made for members of the implementation committee.

Other issues raised: inadequacy of travel grant money. Provost agreed and promised to pursue avenues for increasing.

February 17, 2005

Met with VP Kyle Cavanaugh to discuss health plans at UT. Apparently, UT system has better "deals" for employees than do other state agencies. Health care management industry is undergoing change, and we will keep our eye on what is best for UT faculty and staff. Mark Alpert and Kyle will conduct Faculty Benefits Survey again in 2005-06. Kyle will return to the committee to present data on health plans at peer institutions. This was the final 04-05 meeting for the full Faculty Welfare Committee.

March 22, 2005

Meeting of Implementation Committee with Provost Ekland-Olson. Members included four members of the Faculty Welfare Committee: Hillary Hart, Martha Hilley, Doug Burger, and Elizabeth Abel. The committee also included Deans Richard Lariviere and Mary Ann Rankin. The Langlois report was combed through for acceptability, especially to the two deans. Suggestions for revision were made and then forwarded to Hillary Hart for incorporation into the final document.

May 23, 2005

Hart met with Provost Ekland-Olson to finalize Langlois report. Plans made for publicizing the report to the faculty in Fall 2005. Hart then reformatted report and sent it to Provost Ekland-Olson on June 21, 2005, to be forwarded on to President Faulkner. Ekland-Olson accepted and promised to send on.

Hart also sent to provost, at his request, a table prepared by committee member Neuberger comparing UT's travel grants with our peer institutions'. Provost agreed to work with committee in the future to address this serious lack of adequate financial support for faculty travel.

Hillary Hart, chair

A-6 Rules Committee of the General Faculty

The committee convened once during the academic year 2004-05 but due to inability to elect a chair the committee decided to meet no more.

A-7 University of Texas Press Advisory Committee

The Faculty Advisory Committee meets approximately every six weeks to consider UT Press staff recommendations concerning manuscripts under consideration. Committee members are provided the readers' reports and other relevant information in advance of each meeting. Attending each meeting are the key staff of the UT Press. Presentations are made concerning the manuscripts, and the committee and staff discuss the recommendations before the committee proceeds to a vote on the submission. Occasionally, the committee also is solicited for its opinion concerning matters of concern to the Press. The advisory committee worked well during this academic year.

Michael J. Churgin, chair

B. STUDENT SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES COMMITTEES

B-1 Committee on Financial Aid to Students

Committee Membership

Members, 2004-2005:

Gordon, Edmund (Ted)	2003-2005	associate professor, anthropology
Loop, Roseann	2004-2006	professor, human ecology
Pomeroy, Elizabeth C., chair	2004-2006	associate professor, social work
Stavchansky, Salomon A.	2003-2005	professor, pharmacy
Wheat, Harovel G.	2004-2006	professor, mechanical engineering

Faculty Council Appointees:

Hoad, Neville	2004-2005	associate professor, English
Kovar, Desiderio	2004-2005	associate professor, mechanical engineering

Students:

Carpenter, Benjamin H.	2004-2005	Student Government representative, finance
Hines, Christine D.	2004-2005	Student Government representative, psychology
Grandusky, Eric Joseph	2004-2005	Graduate Student Assembly representative, petroleum engineering
Fang, Tse-Han Amy	2004-2005	Student Government representative, unspecified honors
Shukla, Geeta	2004-2005	Student Government representative, business honors

Administrative Advisors:

Burt, Lawrence W.	<i>ex officio</i>	director, Student Financial Services
Dollard, John D.	<i>ex officio</i>	associate dean, Graduate Studies
Alvarado-Boyd, Susan	<i>ex officio</i>	student affairs administrator, Dean of Students Office

Committee Function

The official function of the committee is to initiate and review policies and procedures regarding financial aid matters and to hear student appeals regarding decisions of the Office of Student Financial Services.

Introduction

Associate Vice President Lawrence Burt provided to the committee an assessment of the state of financial aid at UT Austin. The largest amount of financial aid money that flows through the UT Office of Student Financial Services is in the form of loans. With regard to scholarships, UT is third in the nation after Harvard and the University of Florida in National Merit Scholarships and believed to be first in National Hispanic Scholarships. Scholarships from foundations like the Terry, Gates, Ford, Conoco-Phillips, etc. are also substantial. In addition, UT offers an impressive amount of aid for non-academic performance in the areas of music, athletics, and community service. There were also a number of scholarships devoted to increasing diversity at the University. The President's Achievement Scholarship (PAS) is a multi-level, multi-year scholarship based on an adversity index, the Longhorn Opportunity Scholarship (LOS) is a broad-spectrum scholarship and support program for students from high schools that are under-represented at UT Austin, and the First Generation Scholarship is awarded to first generation students from HB400 high schools.

Financial Aid Survey of Undergraduate Students

The continued increase in the cost of higher education will probably trigger an increase in the number of students serviced by the Office of Student Financial Services (OSFS). The OSFS has done an excellent job in improving the process that students and families use to receive financial aid assistance. During the previous year, the committee chair, at the behest of the committee developed a web-based survey to explore how students view the services offered by the financial aid office. The survey was conducted in the spring of 2004. Funding to conduct the survey was provided by the OSFS. During the current year, the committee reviewed the results, and the OSFS responded to concerns identified by the survey.

Ron Brown Scholarships

The dependents of UT Austin faculty and staff were encouraged to apply for the Ronald M. and Marilou D. Brown Endowed Scholarship, named in honor of the former vice president for student affairs and his wife. The scholarship is awarded only to full-time undergraduate students (including incoming freshmen and transfer students) who are the dependents of regular, retired, or deceased UT Austin faculty or staff.

The committee evaluated the applicants and awarded a record of twelve scholarships, five to continuing students and seven to entering students. The recipients will be announced prior to June 1, 2005.

Elizabeth C. Pomeroy, chair

B-2 Recreational Sports Committee

The committee was comprised of the following members:

Peter R. Antoniewicz	Faculty Council appointee, professor, physics
Matthew J. Bailey	Faculty Council appointee, associate professor, Spanish and Portuguese
Glen Baum	Staff Member, elec/mech tech Supervisor, engineering
Mario Bermea	Staff Member, accounting technician, fine arts
Blake L. Billman	Student, Sport Club Council representative, liberal arts
Jennifer S. Brodbelt	General Faculty member, professor, chemistry and biochemistry
John S. Butler	General Faculty member, professor, management
James W. Deitrick	General Faculty member, professor, accounting
Steven Gary Hargis	Student Government representative, business administration
Ankeeta Mehta	Student Government representative, business administration
Marc A. Musick, chair	General Faculty member, associate professor, sociology
John Richburg, vice chair	General Faculty member, associate professor, pharmacy
Erin Skoff-Davis	Student, Intramural Council representative, pharmacy
Tom Dison	<i>ex officio</i> , associate vice president and director, recreational sports

The Recreational Sports Committee (RSC) met eight times during the 2004-05 academic year.

Committee Activities/Meeting Topics:

- September 7, 2004 (First Meeting):**
Introductions were made and elections for chair and vice chair were held. An overview of the committee's role and relationship to the Division of Recreational Sports was provided.
- September 14, 2004 and October 5, 2004 (Appeal process):**
The Men's Soccer Club brought an appeal before the committee. The Men's Soccer Club went through the appeal process. After deliberation, three motions were passed.
- October 19, 2005 (Recreational Sports budget for 2005-06):**
An overview of the budget process was presented. The Committee advised and unanimously gave support of the proposed 2005-06 budget request.
- December 6, 2004 (Membership and facility usage fees for 2005-06):**
The first topic to be discussed was the membership use fee for (05-06). At the time the meeting was held, the Student Services Fee had not been set. The committee unanimously supported the approach of waiting until the student fees were formally approved, and then setting the faculty/staff fees accordingly.

The second topic to be discussed was the facility use fees for (05-06). An overview of the user groups was given. The recommended increase was unanimously supported.

- **February 4, 2005 (Divisional updates and announcements):**

It was announced that a major overhaul of the division's Web site is underway. The goal is to give students a user friendly website that is more efficient and easier to use.

University events that were to take place at Recreational Sports' facilities were also announced. Such events were, but not limited to, Dance Marathon, Poker Walk, and Commencement.

- **March 30, 2005 (Budget and Aquatic Complex update):**

The contractors and design team remained optimistic that the Aquatic Complex will open in late September or early October.

By this time the Student Services Fee Committee (SSFC) had met and made allocations. For the first time in recent years, the committee did not participate in setting the fee supporting SSF agencies. Instead, the committee made allocations from the aggregate amount supplied by the University's Budget Council.

- **April 27, 2005 (Tour and Aquatic Complex update):**

Throughout the year, the committee was updated on the progress of the Aquatic Complex. During the last meeting of the spring semester, the committee toured the construction site.

The Committee is acknowledged for their support, time, efforts and commitment put forth during this year.

Marc Musick, chair

B-3 Committee on Student Affairs

The Committee on Student Affairs conducted the following business during the 2004-05 academic year:

1. Reviewed the mission of the committee.
2. Met with the president of Student Government and the chair of the Senate of College Councils to discuss ways that this committee could better interface with their organizations.
3. Met with Steve Monti, executive vice provost, to discuss how the change to flat-rate tuition would affect student services.

Archie Holmes, chair

C. INSTITUTIONAL POLICY OR GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES

C-1 Admissions and Registration Committee

Members:

Urton Anderson, Richard Flores, Wolfgang Frey, Ruth McRoy, Susanne Pence, Mary Steinhardt, Angela Valenzuela, Samuel Watkins

Student Members:

Michael McKie, Mariaelena Rivera, Marci Rosmarin

Administrative Advisors:

Ted Pfeifer, Bruce Walker

The Admissions and Registration Committee met monthly during the 2004-05 academic year. The committee spent its time on four areas: (1) review, study and discussion of four recommendations related to admission from the Report of The Task Force on Enrollment Strategy, (2) a review of the registration process, (3) review of the registrar's rules for GPA calculations and the change to plus minus grading for graduate students, and (4)

review of current undergraduate admissions process and the CAP program. It also reviewed the function and composition of the committee itself.

Issues from the Task Force on Enrollment Strategy

This past year the Provost requested that the committee address the following four items from the Task Force on Enrollment Strategy Report:

IV. D.	“Limit enrollment under CAP to no more than 75% of total transfers,”
IV. I.	“Office of Admissions, in consultation with the Admissions and Registration Committee of the Faculty Council, to develop rigorous administrative policies to control readmitted students...particularly Degree Holder/Nondegree Seekers.”
IV.E.4.	“Review policies regarding readmission after second dismissal to gauge their effectiveness and the role that the Office of Admissions should play in waivers granted by the Deans,”
IV. N.	“Increase from 24 to 30 the number of transfer credits required for admission and include coursework appropriate for the intended major in admission decisions.”

The committee also reviewed the Final Report of The Commission of 125 for implications for admission policy.

The fall semester was spent in study and discussion of these issues, including extensive discussion with the vice provost and director of admissions and members of the admissions office staff. The committee also requested a formal study of students returning from second dismissal which was prepared for the committee by The Office of the Registrar (“Academic Progress of Students Placed on Enforced Dismissal for the Third Time” Appendix C-1A).

As a result of the committee’s deliberations, the following legislation was proposed:

1. Proposal for change in the readmission after second dismissal policy (D 3796-3797).
2. Proposal for change in enrollment as a nondegree seeker policy (D 3798-3800).
3. Proposal for change in the Coordinated Admissions Program (CAP) Policy (D 3801-3803).
4. Proposal for increasing the number of transfer credit required for admission from twenty four to thirty semester credit hours (D 3804-3805).

All four proposals were passed by Faculty Council at its May 9 meeting.

Review of the Registration Process

The registrar, Ted Pfeifer, presented to the committee an overview of the course registration process, with particular focus on the recently added waitlist system and the pilot project for a new prerequisite system. Regarding the status of the new waitlist system, over 3,000 courses had it turned on for Spring 2005 registration. Eighteen thousand students used the waitlist in spring registration, 13,000 got courses through it (about 71% success rate). The registrar’s office discussed their prerequisite pilot project and explained the soft (informational) and hard (prevention) enforcement options. Seventy-five courses used the hard enforcement and 600 used the informational enforcement. It was turned off for the rest of the courses with prerequisites (over 2000). The following specific issues regarding implementation of the pre-requisite system were discussed:

- Who should have authority to approve how the prerequisite is handled? (Currently it is the departments so there is a lot of variability.)
- What is the intent of the prerequisite? Information or compliance?
- The issue of stability from year to year. What is the source of the prerequisite information? There are three different databases, and they often conflict. Currently the course schedule is taken as the source.

While no formal recommendations were proposed to address these issues, the registrar received valuable feedback from both the faculty and student perspective. Faculty and student committee members voiced their strong support for both the waitlist and the pre-requisite initiatives.

Review of the Registrar’s Rules for GPA Calculations and the Change to Plus/minus Grading for Graduate Students

The registrar’s office reviewed the complexity of GPA calculations and the various decision tables for calculating GPA in the different colleges and schools. They also explained the implementation of the new plus/minus system for graduate students which will take place in Fall 2005. There was some discussion of whether a plus/minus system was desirable at the undergraduate level as well. Student members did some initial

inquiry of a sample of students and found only limited support. Faculty committee members were more favorable, but several expressed concerns about work it would require for large classes. No proposals were put forward because of the weak student support and the belief that this is an issue more appropriately addressed by the Educational Policy Committee.

Review of Current Undergraduate Admissions Process and the CAP Program

The vice provost and director of admissions, Bruce Walker, reviewed in detail the current undergraduate admission process at the committee's initial meeting. At the March meeting a status report on Fall 2005 admission was presented. The committee also reviewed at that meeting a new CAP study (Report 2 – January 11, 2005). The report showed that CAP did increase diversity over the two years. Hispanics were 20% entering under CAP and African Americans 5%. The report also showed that top 10% continue to have higher GPAs than non-top 10%. CAP students are doing reasonably well in sophomore year but do not do as well as the top 10% group. The CAP group is richer in terms of diversity than the group entering under regular external transfer.

The vice provost and director of admissions also reviewed the current legislative session and the proposals being introduced regarding admissions. Given the legislature, at this point, has not passed any bills requiring a change in UT's admissions procedures, no proposals other than those presented earlier in this report were put forward.

Review of the Committee's Function and Composition

At the request of Faculty Council the description of the committee's function and its composition were reviewed. The committee decided to recommend that the "Function" description be more specific by indicating that the committee addressed issues related to undergraduate admission and registration and not graduate issues. At the graduate level the issues of admission and registration are addressed by committees of the Graduate Assembly.

The proposed "Function" description is:

FUNCTION: To recommend to the director of admissions, and to the registrar, and to the Faculty Council changes in policies regarding *undergraduate* admission and registration; to consult with and advise the director of admissions and the registrar about procedures pertaining to their offices.

As a consequence the committee recommended to the Faculty Council that the student representatives be undergraduate students.

Urton Anderson, chair

C-2 Calendar Committee

The 2004-05 year was uneventful for the Calendar Committee, probably in no small part due to the many issues addressed by the committee in the previous year. The calendar committee held its first meeting in early September 2004 and elected the committee chair. After waiting for recommendations for changes to the proposed 2006-07 calendar of both internal or external origin and receiving none, the 2006-07 calendar as presented to the committee was unanimously ratified by the members of the Calendar Committee by December 3, 2004.

This is not to say that there remain no significant issues of interest to the committee, such as the overlap of religious holidays with class and exam schedules and the ongoing desire by many for a Fall Break (one of the issues addressed in detail last year), but only that there were no formal proposals for workable alternative calendars presented.

Leonard F. Register, chair

C-3 Commencement and Academic Ceremonies Committee

Let me begin by thanking all members of the 2004-05 Standing Committee of the General Faculty, Type C-3, Commencement and Academic Ceremonies (CAC). The committee has met twice over the past year to discuss various issues pertaining to the organization and planning of commencement and other academic ceremonies.

Kay Avant chaired the meeting in September. The committee agreed to retain the 2003-04 chairperson of the CAC, Jacqueline Angel, to facilitate the duties of University Marshal in light of the responsibilities related to the Commission 125 event.

A second meeting was held on March 23, 2005. Attending Committee Members:

Jacqueline L. Angel, Chair, Lester Faigley, Judith Jellison, Wales Madden, Susan Clagett, Susan Kessler; Excused, Patricia Avant, Gerard Béhague, Marisa Rodriguez, Teresa Brett, John Graham, Ernest Hunter, Jerry Junkin.

I. *Introductions*

Jacqueline Angel began the meeting by welcoming members of the committee to the meeting. The committee reviewed the agenda that included five items.

II. *Report by the Chair.*

Jacqueline Angel reported that a proposal was submitted from the Committee on Committees for changes to the composition of the Commencement and Academic Ceremonies (see below).

C-3 Commencement and Academic Ceremonies Committee

FUNCTION: To advise the Faculty Council, the president, and academic deans on policy matters, including selection of speakers, in planning graduation, Honors Day, and other formal academic ceremonies.

COMPOSITION: Four members of the General Faculty, two staff members, one graduate student, and two undergraduate students. Student members shall be appointed by the president in the fall from a panel of names submitted by the [~~appropriate student committee~~] Student Government and the Graduate Student Assembly. In addition, every year the chair of the Faculty Council shall appoint two members of the Faculty Council for one-year terms as members of the committee. The committee shall elect its own chair and vice chair, who shall be members of the General Faculty. A representative of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, the director of the Physical Plant, the director of University Bands, and the executive director of the Ex-Students' Association shall serve as administrative advisers without votes.

Rationale: The change in composition is in response to a request from the Staff Council to have staff representation on appropriate standing committees and a request from the Graduate Student Assembly to have designated graduate student representation on selected committees.

No concerns were raised about the proposal under consideration by the Faculty Council.

III. *Report by Susan Clagett, Associate Vice President for Public Affairs.*

Susan reported on this year's commencement theme, the 2005 University-wide speaker, and the new custom doctor's regalia.

2005 Commencement theme. President Faulkner has approved the theme, "Inspiring Ambition," for the 2005 University-wide spring Commencement. The theme was derived from a review of speeches made by the president over the past year. A new theme each year is an important element in helping to keep the program vital and fresh. The theme and related graphic element appear in printed materials and on the Commencement Web site.

2005 University-wide Speaker. President Faulkner has invited Ms. Sara Martinez Tucker, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Hispanic Scholarship Fund, to speak at the evening commencement ceremony on Saturday, May 21. Ms. Tucker is the recipient of the Young Texas Ex Award and has served

as a member of the Commission of 125. A native of Laredo, Texas, she received her undergraduate degree in journalism, with honors, from The University of Texas at Austin. She also holds a Master of Business Administration degree from UT.

New Custom Doctor's Regalia. After five years in design and development, new custom doctor's regalia is available commercially to Ph.D. degree candidates and graduates of The University of Texas at Austin. The ceremonial robe, hood, and tam feature rich colors, fabric textures, and fabrication elements that are unique to the design and to the institution. The most prominent symbol of the University, the UT Tower, is embroidered in gold on the robe lapels. The regalia includes two pins that are worn in the clock faces of the embroidered Towers. One pin represents the institution; the other represents the graduate's academic disciplines and features a band of color representing that discipline.

IV. *New Business*

- a. Survey of Commencement Speakers. This past year a master summary of people suggested to speak at the UT Austin Commencement was compiled. The list serves as a resource, and it will be updated as new names are submitted by members of the Standing Committee and others.
- b. Announcements and Comments: Honors Day. A brief report was made on Honors Day to be held on Saturday, April 9. Two central ceremonies will be held at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. in the Bass Concert Hall with many related college and school activities held on the same day. This year new criteria established by the Faculty Council are in effect over the past 10 years or so students attending UT have become much stronger. The new criteria are designed for a much stronger student body. Mr. John Rando, Outstanding Young Texas Ex and a Tony Award-winning theater director from New York, will give the convocation address.

V. *Adjournment*

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Jacqueline L. Angel, chair

C-4 Educational Policy Committee

The Educational Policy conducted the following business during the 2004-05 academic year:

1. At the request of the provost, we reviewed the Bridging Disciplines Program (BDP) and provided a motion to the Faculty Council to endorse the BDP program as a means of achieving interdisciplinary education at the University.
2. At the request of the provost, the following items were discussed from the president's Task Force on Enrollment Management:
 - Establish limit of 10 semesters to complete baccalaureate degree
 - Increase to 15 the minimum number of required hours for merit scholarships
 - Students must carry at least 15 hours for certain honors and honors programs
 - Allowing enrolled students to apply only once for transfer into restricted programs
 - Adopt University-wide policy regulating repeated registration for courses which cannot be repeated for additional credit, using the policy in the College of Natural Science as a model
 - Develop a policy to limit the number of times a student may drop a course or withdraw from the University
 Motions endorsing all of these items, with the exception of the minimum hours for merit based scholarships, were forwarded to the Faculty Council.
3. At the request of the student deans, we discussed making changes to the way dismissal is defined at the University. This legislation was forwarded to the Faculty Council.

Archie Holmes, chair

C-5 Faculty Building Advisory Committee

Committee Membership:

Almy, Dean	assistant professor, architecture
Armendariz, Efraim	professor, mathematics
Bose, Henry R.	professor, molecular genetics and microbiology
Branham, Lorraine	professor, journalism
Chaney, Brent	Student Government representative
Dison, Thomas W. (vice chair)	director, recreational sports
Ezekoye, Ofodike A.	associate professor, mechanical engineering
Garrison, James D.	professor, English
Gilbert, Jack (chair)	professor, chemistry and biochemistry
Jirsa, James	professor, civil engineering
Leary, Daniel E.	associate professor, architecture
Todd, Janice S.	associate professor, kinesiology and health education
Weiner, Eric	Student Government representative
Samuel Wilson	professor, anthropology

Administrative Advisers:

Clubb, Patricia L.	vice president, Employee and Campus Services
Rishling, John L.	associate vice president, Campus Planning and Facilities Management
Sanders, Sidney J.	director, UT System, Facilities Planning and Construction

The Faculty Building Advisory Committee (FBAC) has met eight times thus far during the academic year and will continue to meet as necessary during the remaining months of the academic year. All members of the committee are acknowledged for their commitment of time and energy to the activities of the FBAC during this year.

Committee Activities:

- **Capital Improvements Program:** The FBAC surveyed the needs of the various academic and non-academic units of the University in terms of capital projects and submitted recommendations to the central administration for purposes of the biennial update of the CIP listing.
- **Artwork in Public Places:** The policy developed by the FBAC now has received all necessary approvals for implementation on campus. During this past year, three proposals for statues have been evaluated by a subcommittee of the FBAC, and two were rejected for lack of artistic merit.
- **Hotel and Conference Center:** The FBAC continues to monitor the evolution of this facility, which currently is in the programming phase.
- **Almetris Duren Residence Hall:** The FBAC and its Master Plan Subcommittee continue to monitor this project as final plans for it are prepared. Ground-breaking is expected in early summer.
- **Biomedical Engineering Building:** The FBAC and its Master Plan Subcommittee continue to monitor this project which is the final stages of the programming phase.
- **Magnetic Resonance Imaging Building:** The FBAC and its Master Plan Subcommittee evaluated a proposed structure at PRC for housing an MRI facility and recommended its approval.
- **Kinsolving Women's Residence Hall:** The FBAC and its Master Plan Subcommittee evaluated a proposed addition to this facility and recommended its approval.
- **Fire and Life Safety:** The FBAC and its Master Plan Subcommittee have consulted on several projects associated with FLS issues in residence halls.
- **Intercollegiate Athletics.** The FBAC and its Master Plan Subcommittee are monitoring the Belmont Hall Fire and Life Safety project, which currently is in the programming stage.
- **Tower Garden:** The FBAC evaluated a proposal associated with the Tower Garden project planned in the vicinity of the turtle pond on Inner Campus Drive. Although sympathetic to the proposal to honor individuals through an electronic database, the proposed facility associated with it was not recommended.
- **Blanton Museum/Speedway Landscaping:** The FBAC has evaluated plans for landscaping associated with the museum and Speedway north to Dean Keeton Blvd. We continue to monitor this project as it evolves.

John C. (Jack) Gilbert, chair

C-6 International Programs and Studies Committee

No report submitted.

C-7 Library Committee

This has been a year of change and learning for the Library Committee and for the libraries at the University (the General Libraries was renamed University of Texas Libraries).

1. Standing Committee Changes

At the beginning of the 2004-05 academic year, the name of this committee, its function statement, and its composition statement were as they had been for many years:

C-7 Library Committee

FUNCTION: To be so well informed concerning the functions of the Library that it can assist in developing operational procedures; to assist in development of both personnel and fiscal policies and procedures; to advise the Faculty Council and the president concerning the direction and growth of the Library; to advise the president in the event it becomes necessary to appoint a new librarian.

COMPOSITION: At least eight members of the General Faculty and seven students. Student members shall be appointed by the president in the fall from panels of names submitted by the appropriate student committees and shall include two representatives from Student Government, three from the Cabinet of College Councils, and two from the Graduate Student Assembly. In addition, every year the chair of the Faculty Council shall appoint two members of the Faculty Council for one-year terms as members of the committee. The committee shall elect its own chair and vice chair, who shall be members of the General Faculty. The director of General Libraries shall serve as administrative adviser without vote. Heads of other administrative units on campus that include library programs and services shall be invited to provide comment and information as the need arises.

At the end of the 2004-05 academic year, upon the recommendation of the Library Committee chair to the Committee on Committees, the name of this committee, its function statement, and its composition statement (approved by the Faculty Council, pending President Larry R. Faulkner's final approval) are:

C-7 University of Texas Libraries Committee

FUNCTION: To become well informed concerning the functions of the University of Texas Libraries. To assist in developing operational procedures; to advise the librarian, the Faculty Council and the president concerning the direction and growth of the University of Texas Libraries; to advise the president in the event it becomes necessary to appoint a new librarian.

COMPOSITION: At least eight members of the General Faculty, three staff members, and seven students. Staff members shall be appointed by the president from panels of names submitted by the Staff Council and shall include two research staff representatives. Student members shall be appointed by the president in the fall from panels of names submitted by the appropriate student committees and shall include two representatives from Student Government, three from the Cabinet of College Councils, and two from the Graduate Student Assembly. In addition, every year the chair of the Faculty Council shall appoint two members of the Faculty Council for one-year terms as members of the committee. The committee shall elect its own chair and vice chair, who shall be members of the General Faculty. The director of the University of Texas Libraries shall serve as administrative adviser without vote. Heads of other administrative units on campus that include library programs and services shall be invited to provide comment and information as the need arises.

2. Committee Meetings and Other Activities

The year of learning for Library Committee members and for University of Texas Libraries administrators is summarized in the following information about meetings and tours.

The following summarizes salient points that were covered in meetings of the Library Committee during the 2004-2005 academic year. Minutes for each meeting are posted at the University Library Committee Web site <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/vprovost/meetings/ulc_index.html>, and some of the minutes contain links to PowerPoint files and other documents.

September 7 Meeting (PCL 3.204)

Professor Thomas G. Palaima convened the meeting and Professor Kenneth M. Ralls was elected chair. The chair distributed various handouts: copies of the FUNCTION and COMPOSITION of the Library Committee, as given in the Faculty Council Web page; past committee annual reports and other reports to the Faculty Council; and a list of items that he would like to see considered at future committee meetings. (See the minutes posted on the University Library Committee Web site for a complete list.) Electronic versions were sent to Dr. John M. Slatin, who subsequently informed the chair that he was able to access the electronic documents. Additional handouts were distributed at the second meeting.

September 14 Meeting (PCL 3.204)

The chair distributed additional handouts (see the minutes posted on the University Library Committee Web site for a complete list).

Dr. Fred Heath, vice provost and director, University of Texas Libraries, gave an overview of University of Texas Libraries—rankings relative to other members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), expenditures and budget, and need for an integrated library system (ILS). One goal is to add \$5M per year to University of Texas Libraries base budget for the next four years, in order to cover the structural deficit, materials inflation, staffing needs, IT lifecycle (e.g., workstation replacement), program enhancements, and an Integrated Library System. Dr. Heath's PowerPoint presentation is accessible through the University Library Committee Web site.

WE ARE THE ONLY MAJOR RESEARCH LIBRARY IN THE USA AND CANADA THAT DOES NOT HAVE AN INTEGRATED LIBRARY SYSTEM.

A new ILS will cost about \$4M. Of this, \$3.5M needs to come from the University (and there will be recurring maintenance costs). Current computer systems used by University of Texas Libraries are limited in capability, do not "talk" to each other, and are outmoded. The current computer hardware used consists of several servers.

October 8 Meeting (PCL 3.204)

Mark McFarland, associate director for digital initiatives, University of Texas Libraries, presented reasons why an integrated library system is needed, the scope and process for such a purchase, what a prospective ILS does for users, and how the acquisition of an ILS would affect the library's services and operations. He repeated the presentation on October 26 for those who missed the October 8 meeting. Selected points in the presentation follow.

What is an Integrated Library System?

1. An automated information management system in which the functional applications (modules) share a common database
2. Ideally there is minimal or no duplication of bibliographic information in a truly integrated system

Why we need an ILS

1. Improve service for faculty, students, staff
2. Improve efficiency with respect to process workflow
3. So that we can deploy modern systems that comply with important standards that facilitate access to library resources
4. ALL of our peers have purchased modern systems and we are unable to share information/resources as efficiently as we should be

5. Increase our chances of finding staff who have the skills to operate and maintain our mission critical systems

With new ILS

1. Modules designed and written to work with common database
2. Software will run on common hardware platform—gain efficiencies in administration of hardware and software
3. Can take advantage of new technology—linking software and federated research
4. Better reporting tools for managing money and collections

Limitations of current systems

1. At least 6 separate databases
2. At least 4 separate hardware platforms
3. At least 4 Operating Systems
4. Unable to use important technology that has been emerging for the past 5-10 years

What our current system isn't

1. It is not compliant with dozens of basic and emerging NISO standards for automated library systems
2. It is not easily interoperable with course management software (e.g., Blackboard)
3. It is not readily interoperable with Institutional Repository technology

Electronic Resources

1. None of our systems currently handle bibliographic information for e-books and e-journals effectively
2. In many cases we have 4 sets of bibliographic data for the same title – this level of duplication makes it impossible to efficiently manage our materials

To sum it up

1. We will get more functionality
2. Be able to take advantage of new technologies
3. Need interoperability locally and with our peers
4. We believe this will bring down maintenance costs
5. This will enable us to achieve efficiencies within the systems themselves that will result in better service for our users

Subsequent to the meeting, Mark McFarland prepared a "Glossary of terms used in the ILS presentation."

October 29-November 2

"Behind-the-scenes" tours of Perry-Castañeda Library were taken by small groups of Library Committee members. These thirty minute tours gave an overview of cataloging, acquisitions, preservation, and digital library services.

This must become a required event for University of Texas Libraries Committee members early in the fall semester each year.

November 15 Meeting (PCL 3.204)

Sue Phillips, executive associate director, University of Texas Libraries, provided a demonstration on the utility of an integrated library system for users.

She started with a look at the UT Libraries Web site, asking: (1) How easy is it for an undergraduate to use the site? (2) Does the student know where to start to find resources? (3) Is there a place to store links to information that they find?

She then provided a look at the research port at the University of Maryland, showing: (1) it offers a quick search option (just enter search terms and go); (2) it will search a set of selected resources (databases, catalogs, etc) with one click; (3) its search process puts up a status page indicating results of the search in each database, etc. (successful link, connection failure, number of results); and (4) its users can save an

article to disk, send it via e-mail, or add it to their personalized research port. Users can create their own personalized research port that lists sets of databases and e-journals that they regularly search, and stores citations and links to information that they find through their Port.

Dennis Dillon, associate director for research services, University of Texas Libraries, distributed a handout that summarized the benefits of an integrated library system for University of Texas Libraries and the negative consequences of not acquiring an ILS. The information is summarized in the following.

An Integrated Library System will allow the library (taken from Dennis Dillon's handout): (1) to provide faculty and students with a larger universe of scholarly information; (2) to provide faculty and students with more control over that information; (3) to deliver information in more sophisticated ways; (4) to simplify your life and to save you time; (5) to work more easily with publishers, universities, and database suppliers; and (6) to achieve operating efficiencies. (More detail is provided on the actual handout.) He also noted that a modern integrated library system would help with new digital library activities as well as traditional library activities. Moreover it will help library staff in a number of ways.

If the library does *not* purchase a new Integrated Library System, faculty and students (continued from Dennis Dillon's handout): (1) will not have access to the information tools available to the rest of higher education; (2) will have access to a smaller universe of information; (3) will spend more time doing research; (4) will use search technology that misses research material and is less effective than at peer institutions; (5) will have access to fewer e-journals; (6) will spend more time tracking down printed journals; (7) will not be competitive with their peers at other institutions who have access to modern information systems; (8) will find an increasing amount of frustrating errors in the existing library system; and (9) will see a reduction in library services. (As before, more detail is provided in the actual, attached handout.)

The issue of students using Google searches was discussed.

Prior to Sue Phillips's presentation, Chair Kenneth M. Ralls had distributed a business card created by the staff of the McKinney Engineering Library. The reverse of this card reads:

- Reference Librarians can help with
- * Efficient information gathering
 - * Industry standards (ASTM, IEEE, etc.)
 - * Patents
 - * Finding specific information
 - * References and citations

WHEN GOOGLING ISN'T ENOUGH

December 14 Meeting (DFA 4.104)

This meeting was in the Fine Arts Library in Doty Fine Arts Building.

This was the first time ever that a Library Committee meeting was held at a branch library.

Laura Schwartz, head librarian, Fine Arts Library, gave a PowerPoint presentation titled "The Future of the Fine Arts Library: a collaborative exploration." The presentation included extensive data about the Fine Arts Library and culminated with future plans for the Fine Arts Library integrated learning environment that is being developed in cooperation with the College of Fine Arts. Selected points are given below.

The Doty Fine Arts Building will be...

- The student gathering center on the east side of campus
- An environment for studying, learning, and teaching
- Nourishment for the brain and stomach

How do we get there???

- Transformation of the Fine Arts Library space into a learning center environment

- Gathering data from our constituents
- Site visits to other libraries and learning spaces
- Transformation of the basement space into a facility with refreshments and a comfortable and inviting place to gather

Transformation from Library to Learning Center

- Seminar Rooms
- Media Center
- Investigating new technologies
- Writing Center
- Facilities/Furniture

Ms. Schwartz discussed the present state and future plans for seminar rooms, media center, investigating new technologies, writing center, and facilities/furniture. Funding for upgrading the technology in the library's seminar rooms (LCD projectors, smart lecterns, etc.) and building a media center (an integration of the library and the Fines Arts computer lab) comes mainly from the College of Fine Arts.

Jim Kerkhoff, assistant dean, College of Fine Arts, spoke in strong support of the collaboration between the College and the Fine Arts Library. Tours of the Fine Arts Library were given.

January 25 Meeting (MAI 220)

This meeting was held at the Life Science Library in the Main Building.

Nancy Elder, head librarian, Life Science Library, provided an overview of EndNote software. She regularly gives EndNote tutorials for faculty and students. EndNote is database software used to create and output bibliographic reference, and includes templates for more than forty types of materials. EndNote is the most heavily used bibliographic program on campus. EndNote can output its information in 1,200 bibliographic styles, styles can be modified as needed, and a database may contain 100,000 records. UT Press director Joanna Hitchcock and Dennis Dillon spoke to the committee regarding the recent symposium on publishing and the academy, which was held on campus. A very lively general discussion followed. **The Library Committee chair recommended covering the topics of scholarly publishing and open access again at a committee meeting next year.** A brief tour of the Life Science Library was given.

February 21 Meeting (ECJ 1.300)

This meeting was in the Alec Room of the engineering library in Cockrell Hall.

Chair Kenneth M. Ralls introduced Ben Streetman, dean, College of Engineering, who noted that research costing in excess of \$100 million annually is being done in the College of Engineering and that the engineering library is at the heart of research and teaching in the college and is important to undergraduates, graduate students, faculty and other researchers. He emphasized that students, faculty and other researchers rely on professional, reference librarians to help get their work done and to know what their research is all about. He stated that he is intrigued with the notion of a single science/technology library for the campus.

Susan Ardis, head librarian, McKinney Engineering Library (and head, Engineering & Science Libraries Division) distributed photocopies of a seven page PowerPoint presentation she prepared for the committee: *"What if there were one science library instead of five?"* The Chemistry, Engineering, Geology, Life Science and Physics-Math-Astronomy (PMA) libraries are generally running out of space for new books and journals, cramped for work space and student seating, and serving large clienteles as best they are able given their various limitations, including service hours. Also, the older building spaces they occupy are not ADA-compliant, nor easily altered. Advantages and disadvantages of a single science/technology library were presented.

A single science/technology library would require building space of perhaps 80,000 square feet, and could provide better service to users as well as study, classroom, and meeting space. Places are available but would require other buildings to be razed: the Service Building on 24th Street and the Van de Graaff Tower

between Engineering-Science Building on Cockrell Hall are two possible sites. Professor Charles Radin proposed a topic for an upcoming meeting: **“What is Google doing?”** He noted the recent initiative by Google to scan large libraries. A brief tour of the engineering library was given.

March 31 Meeting (GEB 3.312)

This meeting was in the Gebauer Building 3rd Floor Dean's Conference Room, College of Liberal Arts, because Welch Hall does not a conference room.

David Flaxbart, head librarian, Mallet Chemistry Library, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the evolving use of the chemistry library on campus and its comparative ranking among its national peer libraries. There is decreasing use of the physical collection and the increasing use of the digital collection. Other issues include the decreasing number of publishers and the increasing prices of monographs and serials, new and developing niches within the literature, and the increasing need for medical literature on campus.

David Flaxbart's presentation included a collaborative project between the chemistry library and the chemistry department titled the *Academic Genealogy of Chemistry Faculty*, located at <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/chem/genealogy/>. The Google digitizing project vis-à-vis non-English-speaking countries was discussed briefly.

April 21 Special Meeting (PCL 3.204)

Fred Heath introduced his distinguished colleague, Sarah Thomas, the Carl A. Kroch University Librarian at Cornell University. Her abridged PowerPoint slide presentation with running commentary to the committee was titled, *The Library as Intellectual and Social Crossroads*. Dr. Thomas talked about trends affecting library buildings and surveyed various illustrative strategies on different college and university campuses across the country with regard to library spaces, their user communities, books, and library staff.

April 21 Meeting (GEO 4.102)

This meeting was in the Barrow Family Conference Room in the geology building.

Dennis Trombatore, head librarian, Walter Geology Library, talked about how he tries to emphasize the model of "clinical librarianship" to build both the collection and to market its utility to researchers – grad students, faculty, and regular community users – by focusing on their research and topical interests and adding value to the information stream by selecting and filtering for them based on his knowledge of their teaching, reading, and research interests. He also discussed the responsibilities of having major endowment funding and how he views this in terms of regional and national collections. The endowment income (~\$30k to \$50k per year) is most helpful in building collections.

Dr. Denise Apperson, associate chairman, Department of Geological Sciences, commented on how important the geology library is to its many constituents, including researchers on campus and at the Pickle Research Campus, graduate students and undergraduates majoring in geological sciences, and undergraduates who take geology service courses. Brief tours of the geology library were given.

This was the final Library Committee meeting of 2004-05.

Library Committee membership for 2004-05 is at <http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2004-2005/standcom/C-7.html> or at http://www.lib.utexas.edu/vprovost/meetings/ulc_index.html.

The committee chair thanks Jocelyn S. Duffy, assistant to the vice provost and director, University of Texas Libraries, for taking minutes at each meeting, organizing the meeting times, sending meeting notices to committee members, procuring lunch, and much, much more.

Kenneth M. Ralls, chair

C-8 Parking and Traffic Appeals Panel

This is the annual report to the Faculty Council on the activity of the Standing Committee C-8, Parking and Traffic Appeals Panel during the 2004-05 academic year.

The committee to date has received and decided 127 cases of those appealing parking regulation violations committed on campus. An appellant whose citation is upheld on appeal by Parking and Transportation Services (PTS) may make a second and final appeal through PTS to this standing committee. The panel consists of 20 faculty members, 10 staff members, and 10 students.

Of the 127 cases, the panel upheld 103 cases, dismissed 20 cases, and reduced the fine on four cases.

The committee convened on September 7, 2004, with Professor Cynthia Buckley serving as committee convener. The committee re-elected as chair Dominic Lasorsa and elected as vice chair Martin Poenie. The committee decided to adopt the same procedures as used the previous year, which included the allowance for a second appeal to a sub-panel of committee members, with a third appeal to the full committee. The committee chair votes only in the case of a tie.

On October 7, the committee met with PTS officers, who provided members with University regulations and answered questions about the committee's relationship with PTS. PTS officers attending were Director Robert Harkins, Assistant Director (Garages) Bobby Stone, Surface Parking Manager Jane Wilcox, and Appeals Officer Margaret Rogers.

The chair subsequently assigned committee members to six sub-panels to review first and second appeals. Each sub-panel consisted of a mixture of faculty, staff and student members, as equally divided as possible. In addition, experienced panel members returning from the previous year's committee were distributed across the sub-panels as equally as possible. Each sub-panel consisted of six or seven members.

Sub-panels received from six to ten cases to review at a time. They generally were given two weeks to review cases and to make decisions.

The committee this year used a secure Web site to enable the transmission and coordination of cases among panel members. Initiated two years ago by then Chair Robert Koons and made fully operational last year, this new system has resulted in increased participation by panel members and quicker turnaround of cases.

The committee has worked with PTS officers and with Jeff Reed of Instructional Technology Services to help improve the committee's computer system. Mr. Reed was instrumental in getting the system up and running, and he has continued to improve the system to make it more user friendly. We hope to see added a capability for a panelist to see online the disposition of decided cases. Currently, the chair must provide such information. Timely information about how the panel ultimately voted on a case may be diagnostic, especially for new panelists. If a way to provide feedback on resolved cases could be added to the current system, the information could reach panelists in a more timely fashion.

Last year, the committee was able to dispose of all cases on the docket, without deferring any cases for the next academic year. This year, the committee hopes to do the same. In large part, this is believed to be possible because of the efficiency and convenience of the new computer system.

Dominic L. Lasorsa, chair

C-9 Parking and Traffic Policies Committee

Participating faculty members: Ricardo Ainslie, James Erskine, Michael L. Garrison, Randy Machemehl, Gordon Novak, and Keith Turner

Participating staff members: Jesse Chapa, Ann Fairchilds, Marcus Horton, and Jerry Turek

Participating student members: Amy Forestell, Rachel Horton, Rachel McGinity, and Chirag Shah

Advisors: Patricia Clubb, Kyle Cavanaugh, Gerald R. Harkins, David Rea, and Jeffrey Van Slyke

Meetings scheduled monthly, September-May, 2004-05

- I. Ways and means of meeting parking needs of faculty, staff, and students.
 - A. Met the parking and traffic needs of on-going construction
 1. Whitis closure — Lot F15/F16 reopened
 2. Blanton Museum/Pedestrian Mall — Permanent Speedway closure
 3. Informing the UT community
 - *UTV
 - *Orientation
 - *PTS Website
 - **Daily Texan* ads
 - B. Bicycle Regulations
 1. Enforcement of fines for bicycles
 2. Required registration for bicycles
- II. Establish traffic and parking regulations and review annually a system of priorities for permits to be issued in reserved areas.
 - A. No increases in parking permit fees
 - B. Parking at Meters
 1. Changed meters from 30 minutes to 45 minutes
 2. Changed enforcement from daytime hours to 24/7
 - C. Enhanced special event parking
 1. Relocation citation
 2. PTS calls illegal parkers before event
 3. Vehicles without permits are towed
 - D. Clarified other existing regulations for better service and enforcement
- III. No recommendations were made for the composition or operation of the Parking and Traffic Appeals Panel.

Randy Machemehl, chair

C-10 Recruitment and Retention Committee

Committee Membership:

Administration

Ge Chen, assistant dean of students
Alan Constant, director of learning center, *ex officio*
Augustine Garza, deputy director of admissions
Darlene Grant, associate dean, graduate school

Faculty Council Representatives

Desmond Lawler, professor, civil engineering
Gwen Webb-Johnson, assistant professor, special education

General Faculty Representatives

Dana Cloud, associate professor, communication studies
Tom Garza, associate professor, Slavic languages and literature
Zena Moore, associate professor, curriculum and instruction

Student Government Representatives

Kunal Das
Yvette Garza

Brenda Jimenez

Administrative Advisors, *ex officio*

Susana Aleman, representative Hispanic alumni

Brenda Burt, representative, Black alumni association

James Hill, vice president for community and school relations

At the first standing committee meeting on September 7, 2004, Dr. Zena Moore was selected as chair for the period 2004-06. Dr. Moore, asked the members to set a fixed monthly meeting date. The group decided to have its meetings on the first Monday of every month, from 11am-noon in MAIN 120.

The group also decided that the fall semester should be devoted to collecting information relevant to the task of the committee. Members agreed to seek information on the application process, recruitment efforts to attract minority students and minority faculty, financial and academic support for students and faculty, and on enrollment figures in general. In the fall semester four meetings were held.

On November 29, Augustine Garza addressed the group to inform them on matters related to the enrollment figures, applications and acceptance of students based on ethnicity.

Ge Chen from Academic Enrichment Services (formerly Retention Services) in the Office of the Dean of Students provided information on the recruitment, support, and services the seven AES programs. The seven programs are open to all students particularly to students of color and under-represented students including first generation college students and students from disadvantaged social and economic backgrounds.

Zena Moore collected information from the Director of the Center for African and African American Studies on African American student enrollment and graduation rates. The information collected revealed that the numbers of in-coming freshmen African American and Hispanic students have been increasing over the years and reached a record high in 2004. The number of Asian students has been fairly constant at slightly over 1000.

Gwen Webb-Johnson made a strong and passionate appeal to the committee to urge the new incoming vice provost in charge of inclusiveness and cross-cultural effectiveness to examine the reasons for minority faculty not being tenured. The committee also agreed that the chair, Zena Moore, request representation on the search committee for the new vice provost position.

The committee also looked at the recommendations for the composition of the University standing committees submitted by the Faculty Committee on Committees. We agreed that the all committees should have representation from faculty, staff, and students. Zena Moore sent the decision to the chair of Faculty Committee on Committees.

In the spring semester four meetings were held. The spring semester focused on activities dealing with the search for the new vice provost. Zena Moore relayed relevant information about the progress of the search committee. Five final candidates were invited for campus visits. Only four actually visited. Members of Recruitment and Retention Committee attended the open forums and met with the candidates.

Comments:

Having set monthly meetings proved very successful with one problem, those members who could not make the time and days were not able to be present for the entire semester. However, regular email communication facilitated interaction among committee members. Overall, it was a productive year.

Zena Moore, chair

C-11 Research Policy Committee

Committee Chair

September 2004 - January 2005: Benjamin Kuipers

January 2005 - May 2005: Alexandra Loukas & John Hasenbein

The main objectives of the Research Policy Committee this academic year were to:

- a) Examine graduate student stipends
- b) Investigate the appropriateness of establishing a Clinical Center for Research
- c) Continue work on modifying our proposal for a faculty research leave program

Graduate Student Stipends

Stemming from concerns raised by graduate student members of our committee, we investigated two issues related to graduate student stipends; 1) whether graduate students who were serving as half-time research assistants on faculty grants were receiving either partial tuition reimbursement or were not receiving tuition reimbursement at all; and 2) whether it was a common practice among faculty to hire graduate student research assistants for 19 hours rather than 20 hours per week to possibly avoid paying health insurance and other fringe benefits.

Preliminary research on this topic was conducted by meeting with Juan Sanchez, John Dollard, and Dorothea Adams. Discussions at this meeting centered around University required minimums and maximums for graduate student stipends. Although we were not able to address appropriately whether the graduate student stipends issues (see above) were of concern at UT, we agreed to continue our investigation by meeting with the Committee on Responsibilities, Rights, and Welfare of Graduate Academic Employees.

Our meeting with members of the "Graduate Academic Employees Welfare" confirmed interest by this committee in the two issues and a commitment to continuing the investigation. Our next step is to gather the data from the Office of Vice President for Research to determine the extent to which one or both of these issues should be given further consideration.

Clinical Center for Research

Given that some faculty on campus require medical oversight to conduct their research, the Health Research Network initiated discussion of establishing a possible Clinical Center for Research. This center would be available to faculty requiring oversight by medical professionals to conduct their research but would also be available to faculty requiring additional office or laboratory space to conduct their research.

To determine the role of our committee in this initiative, Dr. Sharon Brown, associate vice president for research, met with us to discuss the relevant issues. After discussing the issue with Dr. Brown, our committee agreed that the establishment of such a clinical center is an important initiative and has positive implications for the research productivity of our faculty. However, we also agreed that given the proposal was in the early stages of development, our role for the time being would be to support the development of this proposal.

Research Leave Program

Work on the faculty research leave program (formerly referred to as "sabbatical" program) was put on hold this academic year. Although we had several discussions around revising the proposal drafted by the Research Policy Committee during the 2003-04 academic year, our efforts were primarily centered around the graduate student stipend issue and the clinical center for research.

Alexandra Loukas, chair

C-12 Committee on Responsibilities, Rights, and Welfare of Teaching Assistants and Assistant Instructors

During the 2004-05 academic year, the Committee on the Responsibilities, Rights, and Welfare of Graduate Student Academic Employees reviewed several issues with regards to the title and function of the committee; the composition of the committee; grievance procedures for graduate students; recommended practices for selection, supervision, and evaluation of TAs; and issues with regards to support of GRAs. Work done by the committee on these issues is detailed below.

Change in title and function of the committee

Following through with an initiative started last academic year, the committee submitted a motion to the Faculty Council to change the function of the committee to include all graduate student academic employees, not just teaching assistants and assistant instructors. The primary motivation for this was the recognition that no University standing committee, nor Graduate Assembly committee, was given charge to review the responsibilities, rights, and welfare of graduate research assistants. Since the responsibilities, rights, and welfare issues for graduate research assistants are often similar, if not the same, as those for teaching assistants, the inclusion of graduate research assistants was considered appropriate for this committee. Consistent with the change in function, the title of the committee was changed to Committee on the Responsibilities, Rights, and Welfare of Graduate Student Academic Employees.

This motion was submitted to the Faculty Council during the November 2004 meeting. During this meeting there was a discussion of the appropriate change in title for the committee. Discussions with Associate Deans Terry Kahn and John Dollard after the meeting led to the title listed above. The motion was voted on during the January 2005 meeting of the Faculty Council and passed. The change in function and title was approved by President Faulkner and Executive Vice President and Provost Ekland-Olson on February 21, 2005.

Review of grievance procedures for graduate students

The committee received a request from Erik Malmberg, co-chair of the Graduate Student Assembly, to review whether there were contradicting guidelines in the *Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP)* with regards to the grievance procedures for graduate students. Mr. Malmberg submitted a note to Associate Dean John Dollard presenting his research of the various sections in the current *HOP* referring to grievance procedures for graduate students. This note was forwarded to our committee and the topic was discussed in detail during a committee meeting on November 29, 2004. Mr. Malmberg was invited to this meeting to present the concerns of the Graduate Student Assembly about the confusion over the grievance procedures for graduate students. One of the key issues was that there are no sections in the *HOP* that explicitly specify grievance procedures for graduate research assistants (GRAs). At the conclusion of this meeting, committee members decided that more information about the official grievance procedures for graduate students should be obtained through inquiries to Terry Kahn, associate dean of the Graduate School, and Dorothea Adams, associate vice president in the provost's office.

Associate Dean Dollard and Professor David Bogard made these inquiries and ultimately received an "official ruling" from the graduate school and the provost's office. During this process, Professor Bogard communicated with Professor Janet Staiger, member of the Faculty Grievance Committee, who answered a host of questions about the current grievance procedures. The following is an outline of the *HOP* sections that describe the grievance procedures for graduate students.

- Grievance procedures are separated in terms of academic issues and job-related issues.
- Grievances related to academic affairs for all graduate students are covered under the Revised *HOP* section 1.C.2.D.
- Job-related grievances for TAs and AIs are specifically covered under *HOP 4.03*. A change in wording for this section has been recommended by the Faculty Grievance Committee (through the past chair of the committee, Janet Staiger). The change in wording is being recommended to make this section more consistent with the section for faculty grievance procedures which was recently revised.
- Job-related grievances for GRAs are not currently specifically addressed in the *HOP*, but the Graduate School and the provost's office agree that the procedures described for TAs and AIs in *HOP 4.03* should also apply to GRAs.

As a consequence of our inquiries about vagueness of the *HOP* on the grievance procedures for GRAs, the past chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee, Janet Staiger was going to recommend revision of the language for *HOP 4.03* to include GRAs by referring to "Graduate Student Academic Employees" rather than TAs and AIs.

This resolution of the concerns about the grievance procedures for graduate students was discussed at a committee meeting on March 25, 2005. This meeting was attended by Erik Malmberg, co-chair of the Graduate Student Assembly, and graduate student members of our committee. There was general agreement that the concerns about the grievance procedures for graduate students were addressed.

Change in wording for the *HOP* section 4.03

Our committee received the following request from the Professor Janet Staiger of the Faculty Grievance Committee:

“The Faculty Grievance Committee is nearly finished with our revisions to the faculty grievance policy (in *HOP 3.18*)--as you know from Monday's Faculty Council meeting. The *HOP* has had a parallel statement of the grievance policy for AIs and TAs in *HOP 4.03* (within the sections on students in the *HOP*). We wish to bring *HOP 4.03* into parallel language with *HOP 3.18* at the March faculty meeting (when we pass, we hope, the last part of the revisions *HOP 3.18*).

Linda Reichl advised, and I agree with her, that we check with your standing committee about this in advance of the meeting.

All we want to do at this point is simply make the language the same so that we do not have different procedures for AI and TA employment grievances. It may be that somewhere down the line your committee (or even the grievance committee) might wish to argue for different grievance procedures; however, at least for the time being, the Grievance Committee would like to have the two grievance policies in sync.

Could you check with your committee and determine if anyone has any problems about this current goal? And, in doing so, alert them to our intentions so that we resolve any concerns prior to the March meeting? Technically, the language should be submitted to the General Faculty's secretary on March 7.”

This request was forwarded to members of our committee. The only concern that was expressed was that the description of graduate teaching assistants and assistant instructors be broadened to include graduate research assistants. Follow a recommendation by Associate Dean Dollard, this was addressed by changing references of teaching assistants and assistant instructors to graduate student academic employees.

A subsequent meeting was held attended by the chair of the Committee on the Responsibilities, Rights, and Welfare of Graduate Student Academic Employees, Professor Bogard, the chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee, Professor Susan Heinzelman, and members of the Faculty Grievance Committee, Professor Janet Staiger and Professor Lorenzo Sadun. The purpose of this meeting was to review the proposed changes to *HOP* section 4.03, with specific attention to areas where the relationship between faculty and administration is not exactly mirrored by the relationship between graduate students and their supervisors. This led to some questions about whether the final authority over graduate grievances from graduate students should be moved from the president and the Board of Regents (who are the final authority for the faculty) to the provost. This question was submitted to Patricia Ohlendorf, vice president for institutional relations and legal affairs. Ultimately the proposed changes in wording of the *HOP* section 4.03 was not finalized in time to be presented at the May Faculty Council meeting, and Professor Heinzelman indicated that it would be submitted in September 2005.

Response to Committee on Committees with respect to representation of staff and students on the Committee on the Responsibilities, Rights, and Welfare of Graduate Student Academic Employees

The Committee on Committees sent a list of three questions with regards to the appropriate composition of our committee. These questions were reviewed by our committee, and the responses that were transmitted to the Committee on Committees are listed below.

Question 1. How many administrators (ex officio), faculty members, undergraduate students, graduate students, and staff members are currently members of your committee (including designated slots which may be temporarily unfilled)?

Response: Seven faculty members and three graduate students

Question 2. How many administrators (ex officio), faculty members, undergraduate students, graduate students, and staff members does your committee feel would be most appropriate in order to conduct the business of your committee most effectively?

Response: Currently Associate Dean John Dollard attends our meetings and is very active. We recommend that a Graduate School associate dean be officially designated as an ex officio member. There are currently no staff members on the committee, but it would be useful to have a staff member specifically designated to be a graduate coordinator. There are no undergraduates on the committee, and we do not see a need for an undergraduate given the function of the committee. There are three graduate students which appears to be a reasonable representation.

Question 3. Should there be any additional specifications for committee membership, such as representation from particular academic areas or specialized areas of expertise, in addition to the number of members categorized by position in the University community?

Response: Of the three graduate students on the committee, currently one is designated to be a TA, and one an AI. We recommend that the third be designated to be a GRA. If a staff member is added, this person should be designated to be a graduate coordinator.

Selection, Supervision, and Evaluation of TAs

During the September 2004 meeting of the committee, there was a discussion of the processes used by different departments and colleges to select, supervise, and evaluate TAs. The purpose of this discussion was to determine whether there was a consistency in these processes across the University. We concluded that it would be worthwhile for the committee to compile a document listing the recommended practices for selection, supervision, and evaluation of TAs. As a first step towards this goal, documents listing TA selection, supervision, and/or evaluation procedure were obtained from the math department, the English department, and the chemistry and biochemistry department. No further work was done on this task. The committee recommends work continue on this task next year and that a document listing recommended practices for selection, supervision, and evaluation of TAs and AIs be compiled.

Concerns about support of Graduate Research Assistants

Our committee was approached by the co-chairs of the Research Policy Committee, Professors Alexandra Loukas and John Hasenbein, who asked to present two issues regarding support of GRAs. The issues brought to the committee are below:

- 1) whether graduate students who were serving as half-time research assistants on faculty grants were receiving either partial tuition reimbursement or were not receiving tuition reimbursement at all; and
- 2) whether it was a common practice among faculty to hire graduate student research assistants for 19 hours rather than 20 hours per week to possibly avoid paying health insurance and other fringe benefits.

These issues were not originally brought to our committee because the charge of the committee at the beginning of the academic year did not include GRAs. However, since the charge of our committee was changed during the year to include GRAs, the Research Policy Committee wanted to determine whether the issues should be handled by the Committee on the Responsibilities, Rights, and Welfare of Graduate Student Academic Employees instead of the Research Policy Committee. In this meeting, we agreed that these issues should be addressed by the Committee on the Responsibilities, Rights, and Welfare of Graduate Student Academic Employees. The co-chairs of the Research Policy Committee agreed to follow through on work they were doing in gathering information about these issues and then pass this information on to our committee. No further information was received by the end of the spring semester. We recommend that the Committee on the Responsibilities, Rights, and Welfare of Graduate Student Academic Employees follow up on these issues next academic year.

David G. Bogard, chair

This document was posted on the Faculty Council Web site, www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/ on July 22, 2005. Paper copies are available on request from the Office of the General Faculty, WMB 2.102, F9500.

Appendix C-1A
 Academic Progress of Students Placed on Enforced Dismissal
 For the Third Time
 Report
 Prepared by
 The Office of the Registrar

Background of Problem:

The University of Texas at Austin has various policies for handling admitted students who do not meet a minimum cumulative Grade Point Average (GPA). Students go on probation when their cumulative GPA drops below 2.00. Students who do not raise their cumulative GPA over 2.00 may remain on probation or be dismissed from the University. The following chart details the criteria for a student to be placed on probation, removed from probation, or placed on dismissal depending on the student's hours:

Scholastic Probation at UT Austin:

Total College Hours Undertaken	UT GPA for Scholastic Probation	UT GPA for Scholastic Dismissal
Below 15	<2.00	<1.50
15-44	<2.00	<1.70
45-59	<2.00	<1.85
60+	<2.00	<2.00

Generally scholastic probation is triggered under two conditions: 1) A student's cumulative GPA is <2.00; or 2) Student is readmitted to UT after dismissal.

Each semester, a student's grades are checked and compared to these criteria. At that time there are three possible outcomes. First, if the student's cumulative GPA is 2.00 or greater, the student is removed from probation. Second, if the student's cumulative GPA is less than 2.00 and greater than the scholastic dismissal criterion (depending on number of hours), the student is continued on probation. Third, if the student's cumulative GPA is less than 2.00 and less than the scholastic dismissal criterion, the student is subject to dismissal resulting in one of the following outcomes:

- Dean grants permission and allows student to continue on probation
- Student is dismissed for the first time and must sit out one long semester
- Student is dismissed for the second time and must sit out for one calendar year
- Student is dismissed for the third time and must sit out for three calendar years
- Student is dismissed for the fourth time and this is permanent.

This report will focus on students who have a "P" on their academic record, that is, have been dismissed for the third time and must sit out for three calendar years.

Statement of Problem:

It is well understood that a student who is placed on enforced dismissal for the third time is struggling to succeed at The University of Texas at Austin. However, to date, it has been unknown how many students placed on enforced dismissal for the third time actually go on to finish their undergraduate degrees at The University of Texas. Are these struggling students successful eventually?

Analysis:

To shed light on this issue, a ten-year sample was drawn for the present study: fall semester 1994 through the fall semester 2004. During this time period, 4846 students were placed on enforced dismissal for the third time.

The data show that 18% of the students placed on third enforced dismissal finished their degrees (see Table 1).

Table 1: Degree Status of Students in Sample (Fall 1994-Fall 2004):

	Total	Percentage
Earned a degree	884	18%
Degree in progress	229	5%
Did not earn a degree	3773	77%
N	4846	100%

Table 2: Degrees awarded by School in Sample (Fall 1994-Fall 2004)

College	Number	Percentage
Business	31	3.5%
Education	49	5.5%
Engineering	11	1.2%
Fine Arts	18	2.0%
Graduate	75	8.5%
Law	3	<1%
Pharmacy	1	<1%
Architecture	3	<1%
Graduate School of Business	9	1%
Communication	62	7%
Natural Sciences	126	14%
Liberal Arts	485	55%
Nursing	5	<1%
Social Work	6	<1%
M	884	100%

The data show that students can be placed on third enforced dismissal more than once. While this may seem counter-intuitive, it is possible that students placed on third dismissal multiple times are teetering at the 2.00 cumulative GPA cutoff and show progress for the current semester. In this scenario, it is up to the discretion of the dean to allow the student to continue on probation (see Table 3).

Table 3: Possible number of Third Dismissals in Sample (Fall 1994-Fall 2004):

Dismissals	Total	Percentage
1	4309	89%
2	482	10%
3 or more	55	1%
N	4846	100%

Table 4 details the college/school of the students who were placed on their third enforced dismissal more than once.

Table 4: Students Placed on Third Dismissal More than Once by College/School (Fall 1994-Fall 2004)

College	Number	Percentage
Business	34	6.5%
Education	21	3.9%
Engineering	34	6.3%
Fine Arts	9	1.7%
Graduate	9	1.7%
Law	1	0.2%
Pharmacy	0	0%
Architecture	3	1.2%
Graduate School of Business	0	0%
Communication	32	6%
Natural Sciences	91	16.9%
Liberal Arts	299	55.7%

Nursing	1	0.2%
Social Work	2	0.4%
N	537	100%

Table 5: Racial/Ethnic Breakdown of Students who Earn a Degree after being Placed on Third Dismissal:

Race/Ethnicity	No Degree	Degree Earned	% Earning a Degree
White	2124	528	20% (528/2652)
American Indian	23	3	12%
Black	318	62	16%
Asian American	581	77	12%
Hispanic	865	203	19%
Foreign	49	11	18%
Missing	2	0	0%
N	3962	884	18%

The data show that the majority of the degrees (90%) were granted to students who had been given a third enforced dismissal only once (see Table 6).

Table 6: Degrees Granted by Number of Third Dismissals:

Dismissals	Total	Percentage
1	796	90%
2	79	9%
3 or more	9	1%
N	884	100%

The data show that the majority of students placed on enforced dismissal for the third time were male (see Table 7).

Table 7: Students on Third Dismissal by Sex:

	Total	Percentage
Male	3218	66%
Female	1628	34%
N	4846	100%

The data below show the racial/ethnic breakdown of students placed on enforced dismissal for the third time (see Table 8).

Table 8: Students on Third Dismissal by Race:

	Total	Percentage
White	2652	54.7%
American Indian	26	.5%
Black	380	7.8%
Asian American	658	13.6%
Hispanic	1068	22.0%
Foreign	60	1.2%
Missing	2	
N	4846	100%

The following tables (9, 10, and 11) detail the average GPAs of students returning after their first, second, third and beyond 3-three year dismissals. These averages indicate that students generally perform above the 2.00 minimum standard; however, these performances may not be high enough to increase the cumulative GPA to 2.00 or above. When this occurs, a student may gain permission from a dean to continue on probation.

Average GPA for Students returning after first 3-year Dismissal:

Semester after Returning	Mean GPA (sd)
1 st	2.7619 (1.1435)
2 nd	2.6515 (1.1647)
3 rd	2.6339 (1.1376)
4 th	2.6841 (1.0953)

Average GPA for Students Returning after second 3-year Dismissal:

Semester after Returning	Mean GPA (sd)
1 st	2.8959 (1.0875)
2 nd	2.7585 (1.1720)
3 rd	2.6656 (1.1814)
4 th	2.6132 (1.1135)

Average GPA for Students Returning after third 3-year Dismissal and Beyond:

Semester after Returning	Mean GPA (sd)
1 st	2.5500 (1.0380)
2 nd	2.7200 (0.9358)
3 rd	2.6026 (1.0861)
4 th	2.8750 (1.1367)

Summary:

So what do we know now that we did not know before? The following is a synopsis of the numbers used in this report:

- The data from this sample (Fall 1994 to Fall 2004) indicate that 18% of students placed on enforced dismissal for the third time completed their degree.
- The College of Liberal Arts and the College of Natural Sciences grant the highest number of degrees for student being placed on third dismissal accounting for 69% of this sample.
- Students can be placed on third dismissal more than once.
- The College of Liberal Arts and the College of Natural Sciences comprise the highest number of repeated third dismissals ~ 70% of all repeated third dismissals in the sample.
- Whites have the highest proportion of degrees granted in the sample (20%) as opposed to American Indians (12%) or Asian Americans (12%).
- Nearly 90% of the degrees granted in this sample were those students who had been placed on third dismissal only once.
- Males comprised a higher proportion of this sample (66%) as opposed to females (34%).
- The racial/ethnic composition of students placed on third dismissal in this sample were disproportionately minority: Whites (54.7%) vs. All other races/ethnicities (45.3%).
- The mean GPA of a student returning from their third dismissal ranged from 2.5500 to 2.8959 within the first four semesters of their return.