

DOCUMENTS AND MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY
AND
DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of April 20, 1992, published below, have been prepared for the immediate use of the members of the University Council and are included in its Documents and Proceedings. They are also included in the Documents and Minutes of the General Faculty for the information of the members.

H. Paul Kelley
H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The University Council

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 20, 1992

The eighth regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1991-1992 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, April 20, 1992, at 2:15 p.m. In the absence of President William H. Cunningham, Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies William S. Livingston presided.

ATTENDANCE

Present: David M. Austin, J. Harold Box, Robert E. Boyer, Julie A. Bray, Brian A. Bremen, Caryn L. Carlson, Dorothy M. Chun, Alan K. Cline, Eli P. Cox III, Roy R. Craig, Jr., Wayne A. Danielson, Garth P. Davis, Patrick J. Davis, James T. Doluisio, John R. Durbin, David V. Edwards, Helen L. Erickson, Gerhard J. Fonken, Alan W. Friedman, J. David Gavenda, Douglas J. Gibbins, David B. Gracy II, Betsy S. Greenberg, Sue A. Greninger, Thomas M. Hatfield, Hubert P. Heinen, George K. Herbert, Martha F. Hilley, Joseph M. Horn, Ira Iscoe, Gaylord A. Jentz, Sharon H. Justice, Manuel J. Justiz, H. Paul Kelley, Robert D. King, Karrol A. Kitt, G. Barrie Kitto, Dale E. Klein, Joseph E. Kruppa, Judith H. Langlois, Desmond F. Lawler, William S. Livingston, Leon E. Long, Wayne C. Marshall, Christine M. Maziar, Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr., Stephanie Meyerson, John C. Middleton, Damon G. Munchus, Shirley B. Perry, Dolores Sands, Alan T. Schauer, Philip S. Schmidt, Brooke E. Sheldon, Max R. Sherman, Charles M. Silver, Waneen W. Spirduso, Michael P. Starbird, Madeline C. Sutherland, Richard P. Swallow, Paul J. Szaniszlo, Michael C. Tusa, James W. Vick, Jon S. Whitmore, Christine L. Williams, Robert E. Witt, Baxter F. Womack, Paul B. Woodruff, Herbert H. Woodson.

Absent: Harold W. Billings, Shirley F. Binder, Rebecca L. Brooks (excused), William H. Cunningham (excused), John A. Daly (excused), James Duban (excused), Manfred Fink, G. Charles Franklin, James V. Hoffman, Robert C. Jeffrey (excused), Randall M. Parker (excused), Robert C. Rickards, Ricardo Romo, Edwin R. Sharpe, Jr. (excused), Cynthia W. Shelmerdine, Mark D. Shermis, Linda M. Thibodeau (excused), Robert C. Witt (excused), Mark G. Yudof (excused).

Total members present: 69

Total members absent: 19

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

A. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MARCH 23, 1992 (D&P 14235-14248/D&M 19671-19684). (ACTION POSTPONED)

The Minutes of the meeting of March 23, 1992, had not yet been distributed.

II. SECRETARY'S REPORT (D&P 14181-14193).

The Secretary's Report (D&P 14181-14193) had been distributed prior to the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION OF SECRETARY'S REPORT.

Alan W. Friedman (English) referred to Item V.B of the Secretary's Report, on D&P 14181-14182, regarding the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee of the University Council to recommend an appropriate internal mechanism for resolving disputes over the contents of required undergraduate courses (D&P 13607). Mr. Friedman spoke as Chair of the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, which had discussed the response from the President. "We continue to be concerned that there are no clear safeguards, procedures, and commitments spelled out with regard to the faculty's role in curricula concerning required undergraduate courses and that the procedures remain, at least to us, uncertain and perhaps different in different colleges.... We are requesting that the Educational Policy Committee look ... into this situation and perhaps work with us to see what, if anything, should be done at this point to insure the proper role of faculty in the establishment and determination of curricula for undergraduates. We will also be asking that the [Faculty] Senate put this item on its agenda for its next meeting to discuss the situation. We would, in the meantime, welcome any advice, input, [or] suggestions that any member of the Council might have with regard to this matter."

He MOVED that the original action by the University Council together with the President's letter of response be referred to the Educational Policy Committee for comment and consideration as to whether further action is indicated.

The motion was seconded and APPROVED by voice vote.

IV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

A. QUESTION ABOUT THE SELECTION OF A NEW PRESIDENT.

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) asked about the origin of the rule that only two people may be nominated by each faculty member for the committee to select a new president; he said he knew of at least five very capable people that he would like to nominate. He also asked why the number of faculty members on the selection committee was reduced from five to three. He said: "I worry about the homogenization of the [U.T.] System. [For example,] U.T. Permian Basin has ... 60 faculty members ..., [other component institutions have 400 or so faculty members], and [U.T. Austin has] close to 1,900 tenure and tenure-track people, [yet we all get] the same [number] of faculty [members on the selection committee]."

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) responded to Mr. Iscoe's first question, pointing out that, "here at the University, when we select ... people by the Hare system, each member of the faculty gets to nominate two people to appear on the ballot. The number of people nominated is related to the number of positions that are open, now three.... This is more or less the tradition ... for electing faculty representatives."

John R. Durbin (Mathematics) said: "In response to Mr. Iscoe's second question, the Committee of Former Chairs of the Faculty Senate did send a letter through the President to [Board of Regents] Chairman Beecherl raising the question about having just three rather than five faculty members on the advisory committee for the selection of the new president and, as you know from following the [news reports], no change was made in the composition of the committee. We did receive a reply ... explaining why it was not changed ...; [the explanation was] satisfactory to some, but probably not to others. But at least an attempt was made to try to get the number increased from three up to five."

Vice President Livingston pointed out that some changes had been made in the composition of the committee at the last Regent's meeting. Patricia A. Ohlendorf (Vice Provost), who was granted privileges of the floor by Vice President Livingston, said two changes had been made. The first was that two non-faculty employees, one administrative and one classified, were added to the committee; the President would be inviting nominations for those. The second was that the Chairman of the Board of Regents could appoint three instead of two community representatives to the committee. In addition, an extra provision was added that, "in appointing people to the committee, [consideration should be given to] full representation of the people of the state, including women and minorities."

Mr. Durbin added that the main reason Chairman Beecherl had given for not increasing the number of faculty members on the advisory committee to five was that the procedure applies to all campuses. It was felt that three were enough, on the average, for the smallest campus. "We do have a more diverse and larger faculty, and apparently they did not feel they could change the rule just to fit us...."

B. QUESTION ABOUT THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE UNDERGRADUATE EXPERIENCE (THE BEAN COMMITTEE).

Wayne C. Marshall (Cabinet of College Councils) asked when the administration would respond to the recommendations made in the Report of the Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (D&P 13916-13980). Vice President Livingston said that he could not answer that question.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS--None.

VI. PETITIONS--None.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

A. PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE OFFICIAL CALENDAR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN (D&P 13983; D&P 14171-14172). (CONSIDERED LATER IN MEETING).

Vice President Livingston ruled that consideration of this item would be postponed until the chair of the Calendar Committee arrived.

VIII. REPORTS--None.

IX. NEW BUSINESS.

A. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE GENERAL INFORMATION PART OF THE U.T. AUSTIN CATALOG, 1991-1992 (D&P 14175-14180). (APPROVED)

Michael P. Starbird (Mathematics) described several changes to the *General Information* part of the U.T. Austin Catalog, 1991-1992, as proposed by the Educational Policy Committee. The first, regarding the quantity of work rule, would simplify the statement about the number of semester credit hours for which a student may enroll--the number would be 17 without permission of a dean. The second proposal would cross out the redundant statements under "Effect of a semester grade of F" and "Higher work after failure." Third, among several proposed changes under "Adding and Dropping Courses," the one substantive change would give the dean authority to deal with nonacademic drops for undergraduates during the period between the fourth week and approximately the eighth week of the semester.

Mr. Starbird MOVED that the proposed changes be accepted. The motion was seconded and APPROVED unanimously by voice vote without discussion.

B. PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNIVERSITY STANDING COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY (D&P 14153-14155). (APPROVED)

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) Chair of the Committee on Committees, presented a proposal for the establishment of a standing Committee of the General Faculty on Research Policy, as follows:

The University of Texas at Austin shall establish a Research Policy Committee as a standing committee of the General Faculty.

The composition of the Research Policy Committee shall be nine members of the General Faculty and two students. No more than one faculty member of the Committee shall be from a given College or School. At least one of the student members of the Committee shall be a graduate student enrolled in one of the Ph.D. Programs of the Graduate School. The Committee shall elect its own chair. The Executive Vice President and Provost shall serve as administrative advisor to the Committee. Faculty members of the Committee shall be appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Committee on Committees. Student members of the Committee shall be appointed by the President on the recommendation of the Student Assembly.

The Research Policy Committee shall have the following functions:

1. Emphasize the importance of the research mission as a component of the overall mission of the University and strive to enhance the positive relationship between the research mission and other components of the University's overall mission.

2. Increase faculty involvement in the development of the research mission of the University and the development of policies that will serve to enhance that specific component of the University's overall mission.

3. Provide for wider dissemination of information concerning the research mission of the University and how that mission is being discharged.

Mr. McDaniel MOVED that the recommendation be accepted. He added that the Faculty Senate, the University Council, and the Graduate Assembly had each previously recommended that a standing committee on research be established; the University Council had sent the recommendation to the President, who had referred it to the Committee on Committees. The motion was seconded.

Gaylord P. Jentz (Management Science and Information Systems) MOVED to amend the proposal so that the President would select the chair instead of the committee electing its own chair. In the years he had served as chair of the Committee on Committees, he had found that, when a chair was not appointed by the President, sometimes the committee had a great deal of difficulty calling its first meeting. The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. McDaniel said that the committee had discussed that possibility and had decided that it wanted the chair to be elected.

The motion to amend was then DEFEATED by a voice vote.

The motion to establish a standing Committee of the General Faculty on Research Policy was then APPROVED unanimously by voice vote.

C. ESTABLISHMENT OF A PERMANENT UNIVERSITY-WIDE HOLIDAY TO HONOR THE BIRTHDAY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. (D&P 14156-14157). (APPROVED)

Damon G. Munchus (Students' Association) presented a resolution to support the establishment of a permanent University-wide holiday to honor the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as follows:

WHEREAS: Martin Luther King, Jr., was one of the most important leaders of the civil rights movement in our country's history, and

WHEREAS: recognizing that this university has already shown a commitment to honoring Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., through its cooperation and assistance in erecting a statue of Dr. King on campus, and

WHEREAS: the state Legislature has determined that this is a State holiday, The University of Texas at Austin should maintain its reputation as a world class state university by doing the same, now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN: that the University Council supports the establishment of a permanent University-wide holiday to honor the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., on the third Monday of January.

Mr. Munchus said: "The state has recognized this as an official state-wide holiday, and ... it is time that the University officially does the same. Also, this is one of the proposals that came from the Calendar Committee." He MOVED that the resolution be adopted. The motion was seconded.

Vice President Livingston suggested that, since this was an action by the Calendar Committee, perhaps action by the Council should be delayed until the Chair of the Calendar Committee arrived.

Wayne A. Danielson (Journalism) responded: "The University Council is assembled, and ..., it is the rule-making body for the University. I think we should just go ahead and make the rules."

Garth P. Davis (Students' Association) MOVED that privileges of the floor be extended to Tim Fitzer, a student member of the Calendar Committee. The motion was seconded and APPROVED. Tim A. Fitzer (student) reported that the Calendar Committee had approved the resolution unanimously.

Stephanie Meyerson (Students' Association) added that approval of the resolution would be a formality, because the holiday is already on the calendar for the next three years.

The motion was then APPROVED by voice vote.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS ON TEACHING/RESEARCH BALANCE (D&P 14158-14162). (APPROVED)

John R. Durbin (Mathematics), Chair of the Faculty Senate, presented the Faculty Senate recommendations on teaching/research balance as five separate motions; each would require further action, as indicated. He MOVED that privileges of the floor be extended to the members of the Faculty Senate Committee on Teaching/Research Balance who were not Council members; the motion was seconded and APPROVED.

Mr. Durbin MOVED that the Council approve the first recommendation, as follows:

1. Establishment of a Dedicated Fund for Enhancement of Undergraduate and Graduate Instruction (Action by Administration)-- Motion: The administration should establish a dedicated fund, supported at minimum on a level comparable to that of the University Research Institute, and administered by peer review of the faculty. The fund is to provide resources for faculty initiatives to enhance the quality of instruction at The University. It should be emphasized that the establishment of this fund is not intended to reallocate the URI funds.

Vice President Livingston pointed out that the recommendation is an expression of the opinion of the Council and does not effectuate the creation of a fund.

The motion was seconded and APPROVED unanimously by voice vote without discussion.

Mr. Durbin MOVED approval of the second recommendation, as follows:

2. Establishment of Endowed Positions Primarily in Recognition of Teaching Excellence (Action by Colleges and Administration)--Motion: The University should establish endowed fellowships, professorships, and chairs whose appointees are selected based on teaching, research, and service, with primary emphasis on consistent teaching excellence.

The motion was seconded and APPROVED unanimously by voice vote without discussion.

Mr. Durbin MOVED approval of the third recommendation, as follows:

3. Implementation of Improved Procedures for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness and for Administrative Review of Evaluations (Action by Departments and Administration)--Motion: At all levels of decision-making, appropriate procedures should be devised to ensure incorporation of teaching evaluation into deliberations on promotion, tenure, and merit increases. The efforts currently underway within each college to implement the recommendations of the Kirk Committee (D&M 18966-18974), approved by the President on May 8, 1991 (D&P 13631-13632), are endorsed.

The motion was seconded and APPROVED unanimously by voice vote without discussion.

Mr. Durbin MOVED approval of the fourth recommendation, as follows:

4. Establish Formal Procedures to Identify and Correct the Problem of Faculty Members Who Consistently Demonstrate Poor Teaching (Action by Departments, Schools, and/or Colleges)--Motion: Departments, schools, and/or colleges should establish formal procedures to address the problem of any faculty member who is consistently and notably poor in teaching performance, with appropriate safeguards to assure protection of academic freedom of individuals so identified.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Durbin said: "The Committee pointed out that there are very few faculty members who fall into this [category], but the feeling was that those faculty members create a lot of problems for students and [that] they are not good for the image of the University. Academic freedom comes with academic responsibility, and it was felt that some sort of formal action by the Council would be appropriate to show that we are aware that there are a few serious problem out there and that the University should try to deal with them."

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) opposed the recommendation. He said: "I believe that there are formal procedures already established to evaluate my work, that those procedures work very well, at least in terms of shaping my behavior, and I think that asking for additional formal procedures will simply increase the bureaucratic morass through which faculty must go in order to show that they are doing their jobs."

Dale E. Klein (Mechanical Engineering) pointed out: "The intent of this motion was not necessarily to create another bureaucratic nightmare, but simply to encourage departments, schools, colleges, and the administration to address the small but large-scale event in a formal manner."

The motion was then APPROVED by a vote of 37-14.

Mr. Durbin MOVED approval of the fifth recommendation, as follows:

5. Re-Evaluate the Method by Which Merit Raises are Recommended (Action by Departments, Schools, and/or Colleges)--Motion: Departments, schools, and/or colleges should re-evaluate the methods by which they recommend merit raises, with particular emphasis on the balance of teaching, research, and public service.

The motion was seconded and APPROVED unanimously by voice vote.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AT U.T. AUSTIN (D&P 14099-14100, D&P 14168-14170). (NUMBERS 1, 2, 3, AND 6 Tabled; NUMBER 4 APPROVED; NUMBER 5 DEFEATED)

Garth P. Davis (Students' Association) said that the Students' Association (S.A.) had distributed to University Council members copies of the report entitled "Undergraduate Education in Review" prior to the meeting. That report was the result of a year-long S. A. project. The charge to the S.A. University Policy Committee had been to review recommendations from the Doluisio Committee, the Brown Committee, and the Bean Committee, to follow what the Faculty Senate was doing, and to develop their own recommendations. There also had been input from the S.A. Budget Committee.

Mr. Davis then MOVED that the Council approve the first of six recommendations from the S. A. for improving undergraduate education at U. T. Austin, as follows:

1. The "Minimum Faculty Teaching Requirements," as set forth in U.T. Austin Policy Memorandum 3.101, should be revised as follows: The first item under "Adjustments," which reads, "One semester hour of graduate instruction is equal to one and one-half semester credit hours of undergraduate instruction," be changed to read, "One semester hour of graduate instruction is equal to one semester credit hour of undergraduate instruction."

Mr. Davis pointed out some of the reasoning for this recommendation: The Klein Committee on Teaching/Research Balance survey results suggested "an overemphasis on research and an underemphasis on teaching" in consideration for promotion and tenure. Additionally, the Doluisio committee stated, "Undergraduate teaching and involvement should be given priority on campus more comparable to that accorded their graduate counterparts." Mr. Davis said: "The above change would reward equally the teaching of undergraduate classes and graduate classes, which would tend to be more research-focused, and encourage more instructors to teach undergraduates. In addition, changing the 9-point system would aid in dispelling the belief that undergraduate education is unimportant. The Brown, Doluisio, and Bean Committees suggested shifting emphasis towards undergraduate education. This recommendation would be a first step."

The motion was seconded.

J. David Gavenda (Physics) said: "I think there is some confusion here between quantity of work and quality of work. The workload rules are established to account for the amount of work involved in preparing various courses and carrying out various kinds of instruction. Merit raises, tenure, [and] promotion are usually based on quality of work. It takes a great deal more time and effort for a faculty member to develop and properly present a graduate course of technical information than it does an undergraduate course. In our department, we would have a difficult time getting faculty to teach some of our graduate courses if we did not take into account the amount of work involved. So I speak in opposition of this [recommendation], not because I do not favor giving more emphasis to the quality of undergraduate teaching, but [because] I think this is an effort to change the quantity."

Philip S. Schmidt (Mechanical Engineering) disagreed. He said: "I believe, from my experience from having taught both undergraduate and graduate courses, that there is approximately the same amount of work involved. It is not necessarily the same kind of work. Generally speaking, I find that the administrative overhead, if you like, of teaching a class of 40 or 45 undergraduates ... at least compensates for the additional preparation time that I have to do in teaching a class of 15 or 20 graduate students. So I believe that some parity between these types of courses is, in fact, justified. Whether it should be couched in these precise terms, of essentially reducing the apparent teaching credit allocated to graduate courses, I am not sure ... but I certainly think that, in principle, parity between teaching at the undergraduate level and teaching at the graduate level is appropriate."

Paul B. Woodruff (Philosophy) said: "I ... applaud the students' initiative ... and I agree with the spirit of their proposal, but ... I do not think that this change ... would have the effect that [the students] desire of making [faculty] pay more attention to undergraduate teaching. If we are going to recommend some reevaluation of our current workload point system, I think it might be wiser to look at giving additional points to people who teach [substantial] writing component courses, or even better, perhaps, to reduce the extra credit that people get for teaching enormous undergraduate courses...."

Hubert P. Heinen (Germanic Languages) pointed out that the work a course demands varies widely. "If I teach the same graduate course every other year for year after year, ... although ... additional preparation [is necessary], the basic preparation is done, and therefore graduate course preparation is not necessarily that much more difficult than undergraduate course [preparation]. If I teach an undergraduate course which I have never taught before, the preparation is considerable. I would suggest that perhaps the thrust should be on getting extra course credit for courses that one innovates.... I do not think that could be done at this time, so I would suggest

that ... this [recommendation] should be considered in a broader framework and not voted on at this time."

Dale E. Klein (Mechanical Engineering) said that the Faculty Senate Committee on Teaching/Research Balance "did not address in great detail the difference between teaching graduate and undergraduate courses. What we looked at was teaching versus research. One point that I think we should examine is that I think this [recommendation] would have a negative impact on new faculty as they start their careers, before they get sufficient other courseload credit to [comply] with the nine-hour rule."

Michael P. Starbird (Mathematics) asked who established the one hour to one and one-half hour rule. Vice President Livingston said that it was established by the U. T. System. Mr. Starbird then suggested that, if the Council does not have the authority to change the rule, perhaps the motion should be worded differently.

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) said: "The motion, as it now stands, refers to changing the teaching load credits that are granted for graduate instruction, and as such, I think that this is properly the province of the Graduate Assembly. Therefore, I ... MOVE that this motion be referred to the Graduate Assembly for consideration."

The motion to refer was seconded.

Mr. Davis said that the Students' Association wanted the University Council's endorsement and that the recommendation would also be made to the Graduate Assembly. "When the President gets these recommendations, he will have a recommendation from the University Council and a recommendation from the Graduate Assembly. But I feel that [the Council] could act without the Graduate Assembly's recommendation."

John R. Durbin (Mathematics) opposed the motion to refer the recommendation to the Graduate Assembly.

The motion to refer was then DEFEATED by voice vote.

Mr. Durbin, who was involved in the subcommittee of the Doluisio Committee that wrote the sentence quoted in the reasoning for this recommendation, said: "... This [recommendation oversimplifies] things too much.... My main thought ... is [that] this will not really make any significant improvement in undergraduate education." He was opposed to the recommendation.

Dorothy M. Chun (Germanic Languages) said: "While I support improving undergraduate education, I think that the results of a [recommendation] like this ... could have the opposite effect of what the students are trying to achieve. If the nine point system is kept, and every faculty member still has to amass nine points, it will mean that we will be teaching more courses.... From that standpoint, it could have a serious detrimental effect on undergraduate teaching."

Mr. Davis said that all of these points had been discussed in the various meetings the Students' Association had had in preparing the recommendation. He said: "As I understand it, teachers are evaluated by three criteria: teaching, research, and service. Graduate teaching involves a lot of research, so while you are getting your teaching done you are also getting your research done.... So even though you are getting one point, there is still that incentive there to teach graduate courses. Secondly, we do not think this is the solution to undergraduate education.... It is just a first step. It takes away the feeling here on campus ... that teaching is devalued and that research is ultimately important...."

Roy R. Craig (Aerospace Engineering) agreed with others that "this is far too simple a solution to a fairly complex problem. It has not even brought up the number of points that the graduate instructors get for individual instruction, and many of the faculty receive far more credit from that than from the teaching of one graduate course. I think this needs to be studied in much greater detail and breadth, and it should be either tabled now or referred to some committee that can study it."

Mr. Schmidt said: "I have taught about ten or twelve different graduate courses and an equal number of undergraduate courses [in 22 years at U.T. Austin], and I think that that is a mistaken perception, that teaching of a graduate course is de facto research. That is not true at all.... I am inclined to vote against this motion [because this recommendation] is a very simplistic perception of what the situation really is. I think we should ... go back and look at the basic issue, that is, how do we bring undergraduate and graduate effort to parity."

Mr. McDaniel said that the recommendation, "as it reads, has a singular effect, and that effect is to increase the workload of the [U.T. Austin] faculty. Such an effect would, in fact, make it very difficult for us to recruit faculty ..., and it would create parity between graduate and undergraduate education ... at a very, very low level."

Martha F. Hilley (Music) said: "As a faculty member that has chosen to teach primarily undergraduates, I think you [the students] have the wrong idea. [In your recommendation] you have not made undergraduate teaching more comparable;... you have [brought] graduate teaching down." She also pointed out that research is involved not only in graduate teaching but also in undergraduate teaching.

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) said: "I think that students are really overemphasizing teaching being devalued.... Every year ... there are more professors recognized for teaching. I have not heard of very many promotions of people who have done superb research and who have had not very good teaching ratings.... [Additionally], this is supposed to be a research/teaching university. You say the Bean Committee suggested shifting emphasis toward undergraduate education. Not so ...; I was on that committee I think ... we could improve undergraduate education, [but] I think you are going about it the wrong way and I am voting against [the recommendation]."

Charles M. Silver (Law) pointed out: "The purpose of the amendment, apparently, is to encourage undergraduate teaching. In Law School, we do not have any undergraduates. It would, however, affect us because it would require us to teach additional courses in order to meet the nine-hour per semester requirement, and the net effect would be to increase our burden from four to six courses a year with no benefit to undergraduates. That ... would put us greatly out of step with any other law school in the top 20, roughly two courses more per year than any other school I was able to find. He then MOVED to amend that main motion so that one semester credit hour of undergraduate instruction would remain equal to one and one-half semester credit hours of instruction in the School of Law. The motion to amend was seconded.

Before debate could begin on the motion to amend, Mr. McDaniel MOVED to table the main motion and the motion to amend. The motion to table was seconded and APPROVED by voice vote.

Mr. Davis MOVED that the Council approve the second recommendation for improving undergraduate education at U.T. Austin:

2. The Administration should create an endowment for merit base salary increases.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Durbin asked whether, once an increase had been given, there would be enough money to continue that increase. Mr. Davis replied that the Students' Association hoped that an every-increasing endowment would be formed and that the merit increases would be paid from the interest earned on that endowment. "Basically, what we recommended was putting Available University Fund money into an endowment on a yearly basis, so every year we would be putting more and more money into this endowment."

Mr. Durbin then MOVED that the motion be tabled. The motion to table was seconded and APPROVED by voice vote.

Mr. Davis MOVED that the Council approve the third recommendation:

3. The Student/Faculty ratio should be reduced to the national average by 1994.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. McDaniel asked what national average was meant. Mr. Davis replied that the Office of Institutional Studies has a list of 50 universities to which U.T. compares itself; the average for those 50 institutions is the one referred to in the motion.

Mr. Danielson (Journalism) said: "There are two parts to a ratio.... You can achieve this reduction either by not admitting students or by increasing faculty; perhaps [Mr. Davis] has the latter in mind."

Stephen A. Monti (Vice Provost) was granted privileges of the floor. He said: "I think that when we start talking about student/faculty ratios, we have to be ... very careful [about] what we mean. Student/faculty ratios and class size are unrelated. [One] can get a very good student/faculty ratio, by [including] all the research faculty [in the ratio]. They never see a classroom; they have no impact whatsoever on class size. [The student/faculty ratio is simply an internal measure of resource allocation, which is something totally different from class size.]..."

Mr. Durbin added: "The Dolusio committee spent 18 months considering essentially this issue.... We presented a report which called for making [the] student/teaching ratio as desirable as possible.... This [recommendation] is admirable in some ways, [but] in some ways it is not. It trivializes a very careful study that the Council considered two years ago. I do not like to see such trivialization, and ... I MOVE that we table [the motion to approve the third recommendation]."

The motion to table was seconded and then APPROVED by voice vote.

Mr. Davis MOVED that the Council approve the fourth recommendation, as follows:

4. The Administration should increase fiscal support for The Center for Teaching Effectiveness, and strongly encourage all new faculty to participate in the orientation program.

The motion was seconded and APPROVED by voice vote without discussion.

Mr. Davis MOVED that the Council approve the fifth recommendation, as follows:

5. The Administration should review the systematic methods for evaluating teaching that all colleges should have already implemented, and should make sure the evaluation system is in place and is being monitored by the College.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Schmidt pointed out that this recommendation was redundant with the third recommendation concerning teaching/research balance that the Council had approved earlier in the meeting [D&P 14256].

Douglas J. Gibbins (Cabinet of College Councils) agreed that the two recommendations were similar but noted that they came from different bodies. "Perhaps it will weigh heavier with the President, when he considers the [recommendation], if it did from the Faculty Senate as well as [from] the students."

Vice President Livingston commented that, so far as the President is concerned, they both come from the University Council.

The motion to approve the fifth recommendation was then DEFEATED by a vote of 20-21.

Mr. Davis MOVED that the Council approve the sixth recommendation, as follows:

6. The Administration should create a committee to investigate the Tenure and Promotion system at the University.

In response to questions from the Chair for clarification, Mr. Davis said that the recommendation consisted of only the first sentence shown on D&P 14170 [as reproduced above]; the remainder of the boldfaced text on that page should have appeared under "Reasoning" and was not part of the motion.

Mr. Durbin said he thought that the recommendation was unnecessary. "Who is going to review [the tenure and promotion system]? Is it going to be deans, department chairs, budget councils?" He said that these are the people who make the decisions now; if they want to make changes, they will do so. The University Council "has passed recommendations saying teaching should receive more emphasis ...; I do not know what this would mean except [the creation of] another committee. Therefore I MOVE to table this motion."

The motion to table was seconded and APPROVED by voice vote.

Mr. Schmidt said: "I [want] to make one general comment about this procedure that we just went through, and that is ... [that] I felt somewhat disposed to some of the principles that were being espoused by this committee. I think that most of these recommendations were good at heart.... I do feel, though, ... that these recommendations would have gained a lot by counsel of faculty members and members of the University Council.... I think that there were a lot of issues that (I cannot think of any other word, and I apologize for this) are naive.... In the standing

committees of the University there is student representation...; the incoming administration of the student government [might] want to consider faculty representation on student government committees that are going to formulate recommendations that are going to come to the University Council...."

Mr. Davis responded: "The Faculty Senate has its own committees with no student representation.... We have our own standing committees. This is a report that [we] sent to the President, and we just seek the University Council's endorsement. I do not think that these [recommendations] were naive. I believe that we did [good] and thorough research, and I hope that everybody will read the whole report. These were not just simple recommendations. I think it is a very well thought-out report...."

Mr. Schmidt pointed out that there was a student representative on the Faculty Senate Committee on Teaching/Research Balance, who was in fact present at the Council meeting.

F. VISITING MINORITY PROFESSORSHIP PROGRAM (D&P 14163-14167). (APPROVED)

Stephanie Meyerson (Students' Association) MOVED that the Council approve a proposal to establish a visiting professorship program for minority scholars, as follows:

The Students' Association proposes that The University of Texas establish a visiting professorship program for minority scholars. The purpose would be to promote cultural diversity among the faculty, which would encourage diverse study areas, aid in the retention process, and expose the University to potential faculty members.

Ms. Meyerson said: "A major concern at a lot of major universities right now is the recruitment and retention of minority professors. At U.T., we have made a lot of progress in this area, but we still only have 10% of our faculty represented by minority professors. The problem does not lie within the University; the major problem is that there is a very small pool of minority professors available to hire. [Many] universities, like Stanford and Princeton, are now using a visiting minority professorship program, and it has increased the representation of minorities on their faculties. We propose that a similar program be instituted here at U.T."

The motion was seconded.

Paul B. Woodruff (Philosophy) favored the proposal. He said: "I do not know where the money is to come from, but if there is money for visiting professors, I strongly urge that it be used in this way. This is the best use we could make of it."

J. David Gavenda (Physics) expressed concern about the suggestions for funding as described in the last paragraph of the supporting statements accompanying the proposal [D&P 14167]:

Funding for the program should come from an endowment formed through contributions solicited by the University, as well as by regular contributions from the "20" account. In addition, any cash balances from the Unallocated Teaching Salaries account could be applied to this program.

Mr. Gavenda was concerned about the use of the Unallocated Teaching Salaries balances "because departments [often] need those for other purposes."

Garth P. Davis (Students' Association) said that the quoted sentences only made suggestions, but that the Students' Association believed there is money available within the University. "We feel that AUF [Available University Fund] money could be spent on this program.... It is not our purpose to come up with the money. We just gave suggestions here to the administration, but it would be up to the administration to decide where the money comes from."

Stephen A. Monti (Vice Provost), who had earlier been extended privileges of the floor, said: "The Unallocated Faculty Salaries [balances] pay for all of the teaching assistants, assistant instructors, and visiting appointments of all kinds; there is no money left over at the end of the year.... The transfers from AUF that go into endowments are the legislatively authorized matching funds that match faculty endowments for professorships and chairs; those funds are not available for this sort of 'endowment' process."

"[Of more importance,] though, is the question of what is involved here. The University makes every effort to attract as many faculty and as diverse a faculty as possible. I do not know the details of the programs at the schools that were mentioned. The programs I am familiar with are research-based programs, where they offer minority faculty a research opportunity to carry out a body of scholarly work. That does not provide any classroom instruction or exposure, necessarily, to students other than on an individual, one-on-one basis. If it is going to be paid for out of faculty salaries, the individuals involved would have to be in the classroom. The question, then, [becomes]: Would anyone want to come here for a visiting faculty appointment simply to teach?"

Mr. Davis responded: "That is how the Stanford program is set up; they have some for research and some for teaching.... We found in our budget review that there was money left in our Unallocated Teaching Salary account; that is what the budget office ... told us...."

Michael P. Starbird (Mathematics) said: "Since the funding aspect is not part of the proposal, I would like to avoid speaking to that.... I think this is an excellent idea. In many subjects, there is a lack of minority faculty presence in the professoriat of the United States. This is an excellent way to spread the influence of those faculty members to many places, including The University of Texas at Austin. The College of Natural Sciences is currently actually doing exactly this ..., funded by the Howard Hughes Foundation. We have two faculty members--one from Texas Southern University who ... teaches one class and ... also works in [a] research laboratory. I think it is an excellent program and that we should support this concept."

Damon G. Munchus (Student s'Association) agreed. "This program can work. [The] director of our African American Studies Center, Dr. Sheila Walker, was involved in a similar program at Smith College, and she has [said] ... that it has been very beneficial...."

The motion was then APPROVED unanimously by voice vote.

The Council then returned to Unfinished Business.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

A. PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE OFFICIAL CALENDAR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN (D&P 13983, D&P 14171-14172). (APPROVED)

Loftus Carson (Law), Chair of the Calendar Committee, presented a proposed change to the Official Calendar of U.T. Austin, as amended by the Committee, as follows:

The calendar of The University of Texas at Austin shall be modified by changing the first Tuesday after the last regular day of class of the Fall and Spring Semesters to a "dead day," and by changing the second Saturday after the last regular class day to a final examination test day.

Douglas J. Gibbins (Cabinet of College Councils) MOVED that the proposal be approved, and the motion was seconded.

Tim Fitzer (student), a member of the Calendar Committee, had earlier been extended privileges of the floor. He said: "The purpose of this proposal is to help serious students [prepare] for their finals. The idea of adding extra time to study for final exams has been around ... at least since the 1970's when [the Texas Higher Education] Coordinating Board changed the final exam schedule. Now that the TEX system is used for [telephone] registration, the final exam schedule is flexible enough to allow for this proposal. The beauty of this proposal is that it does not change ... the start of the semester, nor does it change the end of the semester, and [it] does not [extend final examinations] into commencement. This change does not adversely affect ... [the] processing of grades. This [proposal was approved] unanimously ... [by] the Calendar Committee. Furthermore, this proposal will give the faculty and staff [additional preparation time] for the beginning of finals. But the bottom line is that this proposal is supported by an overwhelming number of the students, and we feel that it will greatly help us in preparation for our finals.... I hope you will support this proposal."

Wayne A. Danielson (Journalism) said: "I understand that there are no finals given on Saturday at present. I understand that there is a rule, with respect to religious observances, that people who do not wish to participate in University activities because of religious concerns are allowed not to do so." He asked whether people who do not wish to take final examinations on Saturday will be allowed not to do so. Damon G. Munchus (Students' Association) replied that students who, for religious reasons, do not want to take final examinations on Saturday would have to file a petition at the beginning of the semester to take the examinations on the preceding Friday or the following Monday. Ira Iscoe (Psychology) noted that religious objections would apply to Friday night as well as Saturday.

Patricia A. Ohlendorf (Vice Provost), who had earlier been granted privileges of the floor, said: "I want to give some information, and then the Calendar Committee may or may not want to amend [the] motion. We currently have calendar principles that were ... last ... modified in 1990 by the University Council. The calendar principles [contain] two final examinations schedules, the

preferred schedule and ... a second schedule. By your motion you are amending the first schedule; you are not amending the second one, and there are times when we have to go to the second schedule.... That would put your 'dead day' right in the middle of exams." Mr. Fitzer responded: "We did discuss the secondary calendar and, at that time, we decided not to address that [issue]; we felt that that would be for a future Calendar Committee to address."

Gaylord A. Jentz (Management Science and Information Systems) said that, with regard to providing faculty with additional time for grade preparation, there is tremendous pressure to grade final examinations and to turn in the grades within 72 hours. He thought that students, with Saturday, Sunday, and Monday to study for examinations on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, and then with Saturday and Sunday to study for examinations on Monday and Tuesday, certainly ought to have ample time to prepare, particularly if they are well-prepared the entire semester. However, he said that the Saturday during final examination week is valuable time for the grading of essay examinations. "One of the things that I have seen ... since 1965 is [that] fewer and fewer essay [examinations are] being given. [More and more examinations are objectively scorable or call for very short answers.].... So I am going to vote against this proposal simply because I do not want to have to crowd my grading time for essay [examinations] or maybe have to go to objective [examinations] because I am giving [examinations] on Saturday and maybe Monday or Tuesday."

Mr. Gibbins said that at times he has two or even three examinations on the first day and that the extra 24 hours of preparation would be very valuable to him. He also said: "Most of the classes that are very popular have their examinations at the very beginning of the [final examination] period, and thus the extra day would be beneficial to many students."

Desmond F. Lawler (Civil Engineering) said: "I believe that this proposal is going to exacerbate [the problem of scheduling final examinations]. There is going to be more of a tendency for those who set up the calendar to avoid the Saturday [examination period and] to put all the most popular times on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday instead of Tuesday through Friday; so my sense is that [it] would be much better ... [to spread out the examinations for the most popular classes] over the entire existing exam period." He thought that would relieve the problem that students now feel much more than would the current proposal.

Mr. Fitzer said that the possibility had been examined, but the Data Processing Division needs enough time to get all the grades recorded, and they like for a majority of the grades to be turned in at the beginning of the final examination period.

Martha F. Hilley (Music) said that, for the last nine years, she had been responsible for testing twelve classes every semester, "which means I am there every exam day, usually with a minimum of three classes [to test each] day.... That Saturday, coupled with Sunday, is very valuable to me. I know you ... say that you need more time to study.... I think if you kept up, up until that time, one day is not going to make that big a difference. One day does make a difference to someone like me."

Garth P. Davis (Students' Association) emphasized that students do not have enough time to prepare for their examinations, especially those students who take a large number of courses. He said: "I think this [change] is essential. It was unanimously supported by the Student Assembly. Students really want this right now. I hope we can give some consideration to students, because we are the ones being evaluated in [the final examination] period."

Paul B. Woodruff (Philosophy) spoke in favor of the proposal. He said: "Judging from what students tell me and from my memories of my own education, pedagogically this is a very good idea. You learn a lot as you go back over material that you study during the semester."

The motion was then APPROVED by voice vote.

X. REMAINING QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT--None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m. The next regular meeting of the University Council is scheduled for Main Building, Room 212, on May 11, 1992, at 2:15 p.m.