

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

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of October 18, 1982, 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 General Faculty

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 18, 1982

The second regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1982-1983 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, October 18, 1982, at 2:15 p.m.; President Peter T. Flawn presided.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Lawrence D. Abraham, John R. Allison, Mark I. Alpert, Frank D. Bean, Jr., Paul E. Begala, Harold W. Billings, Shirley F. Binder, Betsy E. Bowman, Leigh B. Boske, J. Harold Box, Oscar G. Brockett, Ronald M. Brown, Brett M. Campbell, Heather L. Carter, Larry D. Carver, Ben H. Caudle, James H. Colvin, Mary S. Crockett, James W. Daniel, Patrick J. Davis, John D. Denson, James T. Doluisio, David J. Drum, James Duban, William C. Duesterhoeft, Jr., Barbara J. Dugas, Carla F. Dunn, John R. Durbin, Parker C. Fielder, Peter T. Flawn, Gerhard J. Fonken, Donald J. Foss, G. Charles Franklin, Alan W. Friedman, J. David Gavenda, Donald J. Grantham, Vickie L. Hampton, E. Glynn Harmon, Roderick P. Hart, Forest G. Hill, Ira Iscoe, Robert C. Jeffrey, E. Earl Jennings, Eleanor W. Jordan, H. Paul Kelley, Lorrin G. Kennamer, Robert D. King, Sanford V. Levinson, William S. Livingston, R. Neill Megaw, Robert D. Mettlen, Jack Otis, Dorothy K. Payne, Shirley B. Perry, David L. Phillips, Walter L. Reed, Elspeth D. Rostow, Ramon Saldivar, Joel F. Sherzer, James H. Sledd, H. Eldon Sutton, John F. Sutton, Julie A. Tindall, James W. Vick, Terry J. Wagner, Claire E. Weinstein, Stanley N. Werbow, Martha S. Williams, Roxanne K. Williamson, J. Robert Wills, Ronald E. Wyllys.

Absent: Frank N. Bash, Gerard H. Behague (excused), Robert E. Boyer, Billye J. Brown (excused), Randall J. Charbeneau (excused), William H. Cunningham, Toni L. Falbo, William P. Glade (excused), Earnest F. Gloyna (excused), Thomas M. Hatfield (excused), Thomas W. Kennedy, Larry W. Lake (excused), Steven I. Marcus (excused), Mary P. Taylor.

Total members present: 71 Total members absent: 14

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 20, 1982 (D&P 8853-8870; D&M 14763-14780). (APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED)

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of September 20, 1982, (D&P 8853-8870; D&M 14763-14780) were APPROVED as distributed.

SECRETARY'S REPORT (D&P 8849-8852)

In addition to the written report which had already been circulated, H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology), Secretary of the University Council, reminded members of the Council that the annual photograph of

the University Council will be taken immediately prior to the next meeting, at 2:00 p.m. on November 15, 1982; he urged all members to be present because the photograph will be used as part of the centennial exhibit. He also reported that a sentence had been omitted on D&P 8788; a sentence will be added noting that the proposed legislation had been approved by the Dean of the School of Architecture on September 27, 1982. He next recognized two new members of the Council; Leigh B. Boske replaced W. Norton Grubb as representative of the LBJ School of Public Affairs, and Carla F. Dunn (Speech Communication) replaced Mary Ann R. Rankin (Zoology) as a representative at large. Secretary Kelley also reported that President Flawn has appointed two committees that the Council had requested. One is the committee to recommend revisions to the language of Chapter 10, Appendix C, of the General Information Bulletin; David Drum is the Chairperson, and the members are Heather L. Carter, Parker C. Fielder, J. David Gavenda, and Julie A. Tindall. The other is the committee to study further the recommendation for the establishment of a Center for Interdisciplinary Studies; Donald J. Foss (Psychology) is Chairperson, and the members are William P. Glade (Economics), Thomas W. Kennedy (Civil Engineering), David L. Phillips (Student Representative), H. Eldon Sutton (Zoology), Stanley N. Werbow (Germanic Languages), and Roxanne K. Williamson (Architecture and Planning).

There was no discussion of the Secretary's Report.

QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

QUESTION CONCERNING ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8872)

James H. Sledd (English) had submitted in advance eleven questions (D&P 8871-8874), the first two of which were directed to the President. President Flawn said that he understood that Dean Robert D. King had responded to the next four questions at the meeting of the College of Liberal Arts the previous Wednesday. He further noted that the remaining five questions were addressed to other members of the Council, so he was referring those remaining questions to the Administrative Committee of the Council; if the Administrative Committee believes that they are proper for University Council discussion or can be put in a form that will make them proper for University Council discussion, they will be placed on the agenda for the November meeting of the Council.

Mr. Sledd's first question was, "Will not U.T.'s recent action in raising the SAT scores required for admission make the University still more nearly a private preserve for affluent Anglos?"

In reply, President Flawn said: "Raising the SAT scores, of course, was just one part of the new enrollment management policies that were implemented this year. The top 25% of graduates from Texas high schools are admitted without regard to SAT [scores]. When we were developing these new policies, Paul Kelley's committee worked very long and hard to determine what their effect would [have been] if applied retroactively upon minority admissions in past years.

"What we find is that for 1982, overall, there was a decrease of 949 new freshmen, for a decrease of 16%. Anglo freshmen decreased 1176, or 23%; black freshmen increased 72, or 33%, and Hispanic freshmen increased 111, or 23%. In 1981, minority enrollment was 11% of the entering class; in 1982, minority enrollment was 17% of the entering class. To what extent this was also due to increases in the Texas Achievement Scholarship program I cannot unravel from these numbers, but I think that, based on the data we have for this past fall, we can say that the new enrollment policies have resulted in an increase in the flow of minority students."

QUESTION CONCERNING ENGLISH COMPOSITION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8872)

James H. Sledd's second question asked whether U.T. Austin's new requirements in English would not mean that those entering students who most need help with their writing would be less likely to get it. In reply, President Flawn noted that the question arose from the University Council "debate that occurred over a year ago when legislation on the new English course structure was considered. It was legislation that was recommended by the English department faculty, by the dean, and by the University Council. I approved it. I do not believe it is appropriate to bring up this debate again posed as a question, but Professor Sledd, as any other member of this Council, is free to introduce his proposal as new legislation."

QUESTIONS CONCERNING INTEREST FROM THE STUDENT SERVICES FEE BALANCE AND THE STUDENT SERVICES FEE RESERVE

Paul E. Begala (Student Representative) had submitted in advance the following questions:

"How much interest is generated from the Student Services Fee Balance and the Student Services Fee Reserve? What is done with this money? [e.g., Into which account(s) is the money earned as interest deposited?] And finally, why is this money, which is clearly generated from the Student Services Fee, not spent on student services? (Which, after all, is the purpose of having a Student Services Fee in the first place.)"

President Flawn replied, "Last year, 1981-1982, about \$329,000 in interest was generated from Student Services Fee balances. I say 'about' because all interest earned by Auxiliary Enterprise balances or accounts is pooled in a single interest income account. Now, since we do not assess Auxiliary Enterprises for costs of administration, we make allocations of interest income to various administrative offices for services to Auxiliary Enterprises through purchasing, accounting, central receiving, and so forth. Last year we made two major allocations out of this pooled interest income. [One] major allocation was for Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, which was very substantially in excess of the total amount earned on Student Services Fee balances, which I submit is a student-related activity that we must support. The other very major allocation was made to Married Student Housing, which again I would submit to you is a student-related enterprise. Considering the cost of an education at this institution and the very small part of the direct cost that is carried by the students, I do not believe...that you can sustain the argument that the University owes money to Student Services."

There were no other questions to the President.

MOTION TO CHANGE THE ORDER OF BUSINESS. (ADOPTED)

In order to assure that the items of emergency legislation would be considered at this meeting, on behalf of the Administrative Committee Secretary Kelley MOVED that the four items of emergency legislation be taken up before Old Business. The motion was seconded and ADOPTED by voice vote.

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

Prior to consideration of the first item, President Flawn reminded members of the Council that the Report of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements recommended, as part of its recommendation on the English Requirement, the creation of a University committee which would certify courses that have a substantial writing component. "Since that recommendation will not come up in the form of legislation to change the catalogues of the various schools and colleges, I plan to go ahead and create that committee. In the meantime, I have already asked the deans to begin to look at their inventory of courses to select those that they would like to submit to this committee for consideration as courses with a substantial writing component."

EMERGENCY MOTION ON THE BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENT IN MATHEMATICS
(D&P 8847-8848). (MODIFIED AND ADOPTED)

John R. Durbin (Mathematics) made the following motion:

It is MOVED that the University Council declares that the minimum Mathematics Requirement for an undergraduate degree may be satisfied with the following requirement: three semester hours of credit in courses equivalent to those offered by the Department of Mathematics at The University of Texas at Austin.

Mr. Durbin first explained that the Report of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements (the Vick Committee) recommended that the Mathematics Requirement be three semester hours, but stipulated that five designated Mathematics courses would not be allowed to satisfy the requirement. He then called attention to the list at the bottom of D&P 8847 of all eleven Mathematics courses that do not require some calculus as a prerequisite; in that list the numbers of the five courses disallowed by the Vick Committee were underlined. Those eleven courses represent the courses that entering students could take, and only six of them would serve to meet the basic education Mathematics Requirement. Of the six acceptable courses, only one does not require as a prerequisite a score of 500 or above on the Mathematics, Level 1 placement test (or some comparable prerequisite), and that course is M.316 -- Elementary Statistical Methods. Under the new entrance requirements that went into effect this fall, 37% of the new freshmen failed to score 500 or higher on the Mathematics, Level 1 test; had the Vick Committee requirement been in effect, 37% of the new freshmen this semester would have had to take M.316. Since students entering some colleges and schools, such as Natural Sciences and Engineering, tend to have taken more mathematics courses in high school than students entering other colleges and schools, it is probable that in some colleges 50% or more of the new freshmen did not score 500 or higher on the Mathematics, Level 1 test; thus in those colleges, under the proposed degree requirements, about half the students would be forced to take M.316. In the past only one small section of M.316 has been offered each semester; although there is a plan to teach one or more very large sections, the syllabus for doing so has not been prepared. Even so, Mr. Durbin felt that it would be desirable for students to have a choice of courses. Therefore the purpose of his motion was to permit the five previously-excluded courses to meet the basic education Mathematics Requirement.

Mr. Durbin also believed that credit towards graduation requirements should be given for the five previously-excluded courses because each of them serves a useful educational purpose. Students who are going to get elementary school teaching certificates are required to take the two-semester course sequence of M.316K and M.316L; if the current motion were not adopted, then those students would have to take an additional three hours of Mathematics. By their very nature, those two courses concern elementary mathematics; if you are going to teach mathematics to students who are going to teach in elementary school, then the mathematics is not going to be calculus. Some people therefore believe that the courses contain only elementary school mathematics, but Mr. Durbin stated that an examination of the textbook and the syllabus for the joint courses had convinced him that there was enough mathematics in those two courses taken together to fulfill the basic education requirement.

Mr. Durbin thought that there had been some misunderstanding about the level of M.301 -- College Algebra. One mistaken notion was that the course covered only second-year high-school algebra. However, College Algebra properly taught goes beyond that; while it may begin with a review of some high-school algebra, that course can be taught at essentially the level of M.305C, which is a pre-calculus course with trigonometry in it.

M.302 is a special topics course that was created about a dozen years ago precisely for liberal arts students. Mr. Durbin said that he understood the Vick Committee's concern about that course; he felt that the Mathematics Department probably had not paid enough attention to it, and some of the topics had been especially easy. However, he believed that it is possible to teach that course with enough mathematics at a level that will make it equal to some of the other courses that are allowed to meet the basic education requirement.

Mr. Durbin considered M.303F to be a special case. Only one small section is offered each semester, and he would not be surprised if the course disappeared in a few years.

In conclusion, Mr. Durbin said that he was asking the Chairman of the Mathematics Department to have the curriculum committee or some ad hoc committee examine all five of the previously-excluded courses and, if there are any questions about whether the courses are being taught at the appropriate level to satisfy the basic education requirement, to have the course levels changed; personally he was satisfied that the course levels could be made appropriate.

The motion was seconded.

James W. Daniel (Chairman, Mathematics) said that he agreed with most of Mr. Durbin's points, but he was uncertain of the meaning of the phrase in the motion that said "courses equivalent to those offered by the Department of Mathematics at The University at Texas at Austin." He would interpret that to mean that transfer credit for something like a specifically-numbered U.T. Austin course would meet the requirement. However, occasionally a student receives transfer credit for three semester hours of lower-division Mathematics, course unspecified; would such transfer credit also meet the requirement? He thought it was important that Mr. Durbin's motion specified that the three hours of Mathematics must be equivalent to some course offered at U.T. Austin so that unspecified transfer credit not equivalent to appropriate U.T. Austin courses would not satisfy the basic education requirement.

Mr. Daniel disagreed with Mr. Durbin about excluding M.302. He did not believe that every course which would be appropriate for his department to offer would also be appropriate to meet the basic education requirement. He believed that M.302 is an appropriate course for his department to offer. At the moment it is an undergraduate topics course which varies depending on the instructor; sometimes it is taught with a heavy historical slant, sometimes it is taught with a very mathematical slant, and sometimes it has been taught as a mathematics appreciation course -- this is where mathematics is used, this is what mathematicians do, this is what the profession is like, etc. While such a course could be valuable, he believed that it was not appropriate for satisfying a basic education requirement for the development of some mathematics skill.

Mr. Daniel said that M.301 -- College Algebra -- does develop mathematics skill, as does M.303F -- Mathematics of Investment. His concern with regard to M.316K and M.316L was only with students who were not receiving degrees in Elementary Education; only Elementary Education degree students should be able to use those courses to satisfy the basic education Mathematics Requirement.

Mr. Daniel closed by asking Mr. Durbin to clarify the intent of his motion; did it mean to say to the schools and colleges that are modifying their degree requirements to comply with the spirit of the Vick Committee Report that the University Council thinks it is acceptable not to exclude M.301, M.302, M.303F, and M.316K & L? Mr. Durbin agreed that that was the intent of his motion. Mr. Daniel then MOVED to amend Mr. Durbin's motion

by changing the final period to a comma and adding the phrase, "excluding M.302, M.316K, and M.316L"; the requirement would then be "three semester hours of credit in courses equivalent to those offered by the Department of Mathematics at The University of Texas at Austin, excluding M.302, M.316K, and M.316L." However, the motion to amend was LOST for want of a second.

President Flawn then asked if Mr. Durbin would accept the words "specific courses" to replace "those" in the requirement in order to eliminate the uncertainty Mr. Daniel had expressed at the beginning of his earlier remarks. Mr. Durbin incorporated the suggested change, and his motion as modified then read:

It is MOVED that the University Council declares that the minimum Mathematics Requirement for an undergraduate degree may be satisfied with the following requirement: three semester hours of credit in courses equivalent to specific courses offered by the Department of Mathematics at The University of Texas at Austin.

There was no further discussion, and the motion, as modified, was ADOPTED by voice vote.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE PART OF THE U.T. AUSTIN CATALOGUE, 1981-1983, TO BRING UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS WITHIN THE SPIRIT OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8788-8797). (AMENDED AND ADOPTED)

Dean J. Harold Box (Architecture) presented the proposed changes to the School of Architecture part of the U.T. Austin catalogue for 1981-1983 to bring undergraduate degree programs within the spirit of the Report of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements (D&P 8788-8797). He noted that the School of Architecture was in very close compliance with the basic education requirements to begin with; only minor changes had to be made in the Writing Requirement. Three undergraduate Architecture degree programs are involved -- the Five-Year Program, the Six-Year Dual Degree Program with Architectural Engineering, and the Four-Year Program for the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies Degree, which is granted by the College of Liberal Arts. On D&P 8796-8797 there is a summary of the means with which the basic education requirements will be met. Dean Box then MOVED that the changes proposed on D&P 8788-8797 be approved, and the motion was seconded.

James W. Daniel (Mathematics) noted that the legislation said "certified as having a substantial writing component," which was the language that was used throughout the Vick Committee Report, but Footnote 2 on D&P 8792 said "an English elective with a substantial writing component." He asked that "with" be replaced by "certified as having," and Dean Box agreed to the requested modification.

Mr. Daniel next asked if Mr. Vick could clarify several points about the "spirit" of the Report of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements. First, the report called for six hours of literature; then it said that if the proposed English sequence was adopted, which it was, we would consider as satisfying the Literature Requirement the sophomore literature course, E.316K, together with the upper-division course in the humanities, the social sciences, or the natural sciences that is certified as having a substantial writing component. Was that upper-division course E.346K? Mr. Vick replied that it was. Mr. Daniel then asked if a course such as Writing in Engineering would also satisfy the Literature Requirement. Mr. Vick responded that at the time the original report was prepared, the E.346K courses offered in humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences were acceptable, and the committee thought the course might include offerings in other areas as well. As it turned out, however, no other offerings were included, so only E.316K and E.346K will satisfy the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. Daniel then inquired about the Natural Sciences Requirement. He stated that some members of the committee had indicated to him that the requirement of "9 hours of natural science courses" was intended to mean 9 hours of courses in the College of Natural Sciences, perhaps excluding courses in the Home Economics Department. That differed from the Area C requirement in the past and from the College of Communication proposal that would include experimental psychology, statistics, and some other courses. He asked if Mr. Vick could clarify the intent of the Committee with regard to the Natural Sciences Requirement. Mr. Vick responded that it did in fact mean to him, and he understood that it meant to the Committee, courses that the catalogue of the College defines as "natural science" courses; that includes courses in all of the departments in the College of Natural Sciences except for those in the Department of Home Economics.

J. David Gavenda (Physics) asked if the motion by Mr. Daniel concerning the general education Natural Sciences Requirement that was scheduled for consideration under NEW BUSINESS should be adopted, would it modify the proposal being discussed; if so, he felt that that motion should be considered first. President Flawn replied that the packages of legislation from individual schools and colleges that are changing their degree requirements to conform with the spirit of the Vick Committee Report had been worked on by the college and school faculties as the basis for negotiations between the deans and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. While any member of the Council was free to submit legislation, the Administrative Committee had decided that any such legislation that would substantially change the recommendations of the Vick Committee Report should not be introduced as amendments to the packages of degree changes already submitted, but instead be introduced separately as new legislation. The Administrative Committee had then determined that the legislation introduced by Mr. Daniel would change the nature of the Vick Committee Report sufficiently that it would throw into some chaos the school and college legislation that had already been constructed and presented to the Council; therefore President Flawn preferred to proceed with the legislation on the floor and to consider later any major changes in the Vick Committee Report.

After some further discussion of the Natural Sciences Requirement, Donald J. Foss (Psychology) MOVED that the words "natural science" be capitalized in the School of Architecture catalogue copy in order to make it clear that the courses referred to are courses taught within the College of Natural Sciences except those taught in the Department of Home Economics. The motion was seconded and ADOPTED by voice vote.

With regard to the question Mr. Gavenda had raised about the motion by Mr. Daniel on the agenda as NEW BUSINESS, Mr. Durbin pointed out that the matters that were in the motion on the Natural Science Requirement involved what had been known earlier as the Rankin Amendment. He thought that the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs considered the Rankin Amendment to be consistent with the spirit of the Vick Committee Report, but that that fact had been misunderstood by the College of Natural Sciences. He asked if someone from the Vice-President's Office would clarify whether or not the Natural Science Requirement as proposed in the Rankin Amendment (D&P 8226-8228) would be considered to be in the spirit of the Vick Committee Report. As formally worded (D&P 8226), the proposed amendment read as follows:

We propose a natural science requirement of 9 hours of which at least 3 hours must be in life science (Biology, Botany, Zoology, or Microbiology) and at least 3 must be in physical science (Chemistry, Geology, Physics, or Astronomy). The remaining 3 hours may be taken in either area.

President Flawn called on Stephen A. Monti, Associate Vice-President for Academic Planning, to respond to Mr. Durbin's request. Mr. Monti stated that so long as the Rankin Amendment was permissive rather than mandatory, it was consistent with the Vick Committee criteria; if a

school or college should choose to specify that, within the 9 hours of Natural Sciences, so many hours were to be taken in one area and so many hours in another area, that would be within the spirit of the Vick Committee Report and the Vice-President's Office would have no objections to it. Thus, in his opinion, the motion to be proposed by Mr. Daniel was not necessary because it had already been implemented.

Mr. Daniel summarized the previous discussions by noting "that it has now been said by the Chairman of the Committee and another member of the Committee that made the Basic Education Report, and by a representative of the Academic Affairs Office, that the understanding is [that] all uses of the term 'courses in natural science' mean 'as defined in the College of Natural Sciences -- courses offered in the College of Natural Sciences other than Home Economics,' so it includes the physical sciences, life sciences, mathematics, and computer science...." He asked if that understanding was a part of the legislative intent in the legislation the Council was considering, and President Flawn replied that it was.

There was no further discussion, and the motion as modified was ADOPTED by voice vote; James H. Sledd (English) later requested that he be recorded as voting against the motion because of his opposition to the English Requirement.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES PART OF THE U.T. AUSTIN CATALOGUE, 1981-1983, TO BRING UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS WITHIN THE SPIRIT OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8798-8822). (ADOPTED)

James W. Vick (Mathematics), representing Dean Robert E. Boyer (College of Natural Sciences), introduced the proposed catalogue changes shown on D&P 8798-8822. Mr. Vick reported that Dean Boyer, together with Associate Deans Gleeson and Vick, had met this fall with Vice-President Fonken and his staff to discuss changes in the catalogue of the College of Natural Sciences, which at that time was already in galley proof; going into that meeting, they had not realized that the catalogue would have to be revised so rapidly. In that meeting they had been asked to make revisions in time to implement them in the 1983-1985 catalogue rather than in the 1985-1987 catalogue. They had understood that they were to try to bring their program as much as possible into agreement with the Basic Education Requirements recommendations, that they were to circulate their proposed changes to the departments within their college and to ask them for their approval, and that then they were to submit the proposed changes to the University Council for consideration at this meeting. Mr. Vick noted that almost every department in the College of Natural Sciences offers a B.S. degree program, and the College also has a B.A. degree program which is offered jointly with the College of Liberal Arts; therefore they not only had to work out the details with each of the departments within their own college, they also had to work in cooperation with the College of Liberal Arts to modify the requirements for the B.A. Degree, Plan I. They had made as few changes as possible with the understanding that they should try to implement the recommendations of the Committee on Basic Education Requirements, and that any further refinements in terms of implementing the Rankin Amendment or implementing further requirements on social science courses or fine arts courses would be done in a more deliberate fashion either as amendments to their proposed changes or as later changes in the catalogue made through normal rather than through emergency procedures. They had drafted the recommendations for changes in their own catalogue and had circulated them to their departments. At the same time, they had begun meeting with the College of Liberal Arts and discussing changes in the B.A. Degree, Plan I program, and they had drafted some changes. They had met on those changes; they had edited them and then circulated the edited changes. They had met with both the chairmen and the Faculty Council in the College of Liberal Arts to discuss those changes.

Mr. Vick concluded by reviewing the proposed changes as summarized on D&P 8819-8822. He believed that when their proposals were adopted and implemented, their degree plans would be in full compliance with the

recommendations of the Basic Education Committee. He did not think that that would preclude further amendments or later changes in the catalogue to implement further additions. He then MOVED that the proposed changes be adopted, and the motion was seconded.

Dean Robert D. King (College of Liberal Arts) stated that the Vick Committee recommendations had been discussed in the College of Liberal Arts for a long time, both in principle and in their implementation. When, in the spring of 1981, the Committee Report had been referred back to the College, he had turned it over to the Faculty Council, an elected deliberative body representing the departments in the College; the Report had been discussed at two separate meetings, and it had been unanimously recommended that the College adopt the recommendations of the Vick Committee. In comparison with some of the other colleges, the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Natural Sciences in their B.A., Plan I Degree had had to make relatively few changes to comply with the recommendations. In October, 1981, the Faculty Council recommendation that the Vick Committee recommendations be adopted had been circulated to all members of the College of Liberal Arts faculty and the recommendations had been overwhelmingly adopted in principle. When they had become aware earlier this year that the College of Natural Sciences was under deadline pressure, they had had to move very quickly because of the joint degree program. They had met with representatives of the College of Natural Sciences and had agreed upon the language which, except for minor editorial changes, was the language before the Council. Dean King said he had then convened two separate meetings -- one with the department chairmen to discuss the implementation of the Vick Committee Recommendations, and then a separate meeting again with the Faculty Council. The department chairmen had been unanimous in adopting the language before the Council for the B.A., Plan I Degree in Liberal Arts, and the Faculty Council, with one dissenting vote, recommended that it be adopted. Thus there had been a long history of consultation; the proposed changes had been discussed initially when the Vick Committee Report was made public and more recently within the past month. Therefore he strongly favored adopting the proposed language.

Stanley N. Werbow (Germanic Languages) asked what effect the earlier-adopted Durbin motion concerning Mathematics courses would have on the College of Natural Sciences legislation, especially as it would affect the College of Liberal Arts? Stephen A. Monti (Associate Vice-President for Academic Planning) responded that when the Academic Affairs Office had been working with the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Natural Sciences on the B.A., Plan I Degree requirements they had been constrained by the exceptions that the Vick Committee had had in its original report. However, now that those exceptions had been deleted, he proposed that the Academic Affairs Office work again with both deans and make whatever editorial changes that they felt were appropriate, consistent with the existing 3-hour Mathematics Requirement without specification of courses.

J. David Gavenda (Physics) stated that "the record should show that this major change in the undergraduate program is being made without direct involvement of the faculty of at least one college. The Physics Department never had a meeting to discuss this curriculum, nor did the College of Natural Sciences, and I think that we should keep this in mind in the future when we come to debate major issues of concern to the faculty, which include the varied degree programs of the University. Somehow the faculty needs to be involved from the very beginning. I have no real idea how my colleagues in Physics feel about the details of the B.S. proposal in Physics which is before you because we never met to discuss it, and I do not know how the rest of my colleagues in the faculty of Natural Sciences feel about the proposal before you because we never met to discuss it. I do intend to go ahead and vote for this motion. I personally support the provisions of it, but I do not like the idea of presenting major changes in the college requirements without full involvement of the faculty."

President Flawn asked Mr. Vick, as Dean Boyer's representative, if the statement by Mr. Gavenda was true. Mr. Vick replied that the College of Natural Sciences had had an ad hoc committee, representing a number of different departments, which had studied the report and had made recommendations to the dean. The departmental chairmen had studied the report and made decisions or recommendations to the dean. "Effectively they did add some recommended additions, but they supported the report in its entirety, and it was recommended for implementation. As I understand it, all of this documentation was circulated within the departments; I certainly got a copy of this within my department.... Admittedly we were on very short notice to implement these changes this fall; we could not convene an entire college meeting with one week's notice to report our recommendations. I certainly have sympathy with the concerns that we did not have time to deliberate over some of these changes, but I think that many members of the college were involved in the process at one point or another, and this is a continuing process. We still may modify these changes with time."

James W. Daniel (Mathematics) addressed the same point. "I was, in fact, on that ad hoc committee that was appointed in the College of Natural Sciences to look at the recommendations. As Mathematics Department Chairman I was on the committee that took the report from that [ad hoc] committee, and we did study it very carefully, did make additional recommendations, and asked that all the recommendations be forwarded to the College Course and Curriculum Committee. It certainly is the case that faculty were involved, [although, in at least some cases, not through] individual department meetings and not [through] a meeting of the College as a whole, but I do believe faculty were involved in a major way. I am still, however, rather distressed that unanimous recommendations of that ad hoc committee, unanimously approved by the chairmen, did not become a part of the legislation which came out from the College of Natural Sciences. However, we can [correct] that the next time we are changing the College of Natural Sciences [catalogue]."

James H. Sledd (English) asked: "This is going to be quixotic, but since I had opposition to the English Requirement from the beginning and was not on the Council so that I could vote last year, may I ask that my vote against all proposals which include that Requirement be recorded?" President Flawn instructed the Secretary to record such votes.

Mr. Daniel wanted to be certain that he had understood something Mr. Monti had said earlier about editorial changes that would be made by the deans and the Academic Affairs Office after the legislation had been approved by the University Council today. He asked if the legislation would be publicized in the form in which it had been adopted by the Council or in the subsequently edited form. President Flawn responded that it would be publicized as adopted by the University Council, and that any changes in those requirements would come back to the Council.

Mr. Durbin added that "the effect of my motion, I thought, was to allow the Colleges of Natural Science and Liberal Arts to remove those excluded [Mathematics] courses if they saw fit. [It introduced some flexibility,] and I do not think the fact that we adopt it without discussing it first really means that the deans are changing things after the Council has considered them in any significant way."

There was no further discussion, and the motion was ADOPTED by voice vote; James H. Sledd (English) was recorded as voting against the motion because of his opposition to the English Requirement.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION PART OF THE U.T. AUSTIN CATALOGUE, 1981-1983, TO BRING UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS WITHIN THE SPIRIT OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS (D&P 8823-8840). (MODIFIED AND ADOPTED)

Dean Robert C. Jeffrey (College of Communication) introduced the proposed catalogue changes shown on D&P 8823-8840. He stated that the changes had two primary functions. "The first aim is to manage enrollment in the College of Communication; to do that we have revised the catalogue to require a 2.25 U.T. Austin GPA for enrollment in upper-division courses.... The second aim of the changes is to implement the suggestions of the University Council Committee on Basic Education Requirements, the Vick Committee." He noted that the proposed changes met or exceeded the letter of all of the Committee's recommendations. He also assumed that the language in the Mathematics Requirement would be altered to be consistent with the emergency motion passed earlier by the Council, based on the Durbin motion, and he indicated that the two courses (experimental psychology and physical anthropology) that were erroneously inserted in the Natural Sciences Requirement would be deleted. He then MOVED that the proposed changes, with the modifications indicated, be adopted by the University Council, and the motion was seconded.

John D. Denson (Student Representative) suggested that wherever the phrase "that have a substantial writing component" appeared it be replaced by the phrase "that are certified as having a substantial writing component." Dean Jeffrey accepted the suggestion and indicated that the changes would be made at the appropriate places on D&P 8829, 8831, 8834, and 8837.

James W. Daniel (Mathematics) suggested that the Natural Sciences Requirement in each of the four degree programs use the wording from the Vick Committee's recommendation that said 9 hours of Natural Sciences -- at least 6 in one department; no more than 3 in mathematics, and those 3 would not overlap the required 3 hours of mathematics. Mr. Daniel also pointed out that, in addition to experimental psychology and physical anthropology, statistics had also been included incorrectly in the list of acceptable Natural Sciences courses.

Dean Jeffrey did not accept Mr. Daniel's suggestion that the wording of the requirement be changed to say 9 hours of Natural Sciences, with at least 6 in one department. He said that the faculty of his college preferred that no more than 6 hours be taken in one department so that students could be exposed to at least two Natural Sciences. He did agree to modify the first sentence of the Natural Sciences Requirement in each degree program to read as follows: "Nine hours of Natural Science, of which at least and no more than six hours may be taken in any one department." (D&P 8829, 8832, 8835, 8837.)

Barbara J. Dugas (Student Representative) indicated that the meaning of the last sentence in the newly-inserted paragraph on D&P 8824 was not clear, and Dean Jeffrey promised to modify the paragraph in order to remove any ambiguity.

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) inquired about the proportion of students who could not pass the required Grammar-Spelling-Punctuation Test and whether permitting students five attempts to pass it was being too lenient. Dean Jeffrey replied that 50% of the students who had taken the Grammar-Spelling-Punctuation Test had failed it on the first try, with the passing score being 70% correct. The passing score is being raised to 72, which should mean, based on past experience, that 61% of the students will fail on the first try. The maximum number of attempts to permit was a matter of judgment, and the faculty of his college had agreed that five seemed the most appropriate number. For students who wish to prepare for the test there is a program in RASSL that enables them to improve their grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

Mr. Iscoe also commented that while the College of Communication requirement of a 2.25 U.T. Austin grade-point average for enrollment in upper-division courses in the College was laudable, it seemed to him that such requirements were going to force many students with low academic averages out of the Colleges of Communication and Business Administration into the College of Liberal Arts. He warned the University Council that there would be a limit to the number of such students that the College of Liberal Arts could accommodate.

There was no further discussion, and the motion as modified was ADOPTED by voice vote; James H. Sledd (English) was recorded as voting against the motion because of his opposition to the English Requirement.

Having completed the emergency legislation, the Council returned to the Old Business items on the agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

RECOMMENDED CURRICULUM FOR PROVISIONAL ADMISSION PROGRAM STUDENTS (D&P 8692-8694). (SUBSTITUTE MOTION ADOPTED)

On behalf of Stephen L. McDonald, Chairman of the 1981-1982 Educational Policy Committee, H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology) reminded members of the Council that this legislation had been introduced at the previous meeting and that there had been some initial discussion of it. In response to a request from the Faculty Senate, the Council had delayed action for a month in order that a committee of the Faculty Senate might study the recommendations and decide whether it wished to propose any amendments. The motion that the University Council approve the recommendation that the provisionally-admitted student shall choose his or her curriculum from the courses as presented on D&P 8693-8694 was automatically back on the floor of the Council for action.

James W. Vick (Mathematics) explained that the Faculty Senate had considered this legislation regarding the curriculum for students admitted under the Provisional Admission Program at the University. A number of people had been concerned about courses that were on the list and courses that were not on the list proposed in that legislation. The Chairman of the Faculty Senate had then appointed a committee to analyze the list and determine whether some modifications should be recommended for consideration by the University Council; Mr. Vick was the chairman, and the other members were Jane N. Lippmann (Assistant Dean, College of Liberal Arts), Larry D. Carver (English), and Frank D. Bean (Sociology). The committee had met with Professor McDonald and with a counselor from the College of Liberal Arts who counsels students in the Provisional Admissions Program. After discussion by the members of the Faculty Senate of its suggestions, the committee discussed them further with members of the faculty and with Shirley F. Binder, Director of Admissions. The committee had then formulated a substitute for the recommendation submitted by the Educational Policy Committee. Mr. Vick MOVED that the following recommendation be substituted for the recommendation submitted by the Educational Policy Committee, and the motion to substitute was seconded:

Every student who enters the University under the Provisional Admission Program will be required to register for four courses for a total of at least twelve semester hours.

One of these courses must be in English. The specific course will be determined by the Department of English on the basis of the student's performance on a placement examination.

The remaining three courses must be chosen from three of the following four groups:

Group I	Foreign Language
Group II	Mathematics
Group III	Anthropology Classics Economics Geography Government History Linguistics Philosophy Psychology Sociology
Group IV	Astronomy Biology Botany Chemistry Computer Sciences Geology Microbiology Physics Zoology

A provisionally admitted student will be required to register according to the published schedule and to participate in an orientation program at the time of registration.

A provisionally admitted student who completes the prescribed courses with a grade-point average of at least 2.0 will be granted regular admission to the University. A provisionally admitted student who does not complete these courses or who earns a grade-point average less than 2.0 will be dismissed from the University.

Mr. Vick indicated that his committee was in general agreement with the position expressed by the Educational Policy Committee in the three introductory paragraphs that preceded its recommendation. He then noted the primary ways in which the substitute recommendation differed from that of the Educational Policy Committee:

(1) The specific required course in English would be determined by the Department of English on the basis of the student's performance on the placement examination; if E.406 or E.506 seemed to be needed by a given student instead of E.306, then that student would be required to take the needed course, but better-prepared students would only have to take a 3-hour English course.

(2) The other three required courses would be chosen from three of the four groups of departments listed, one of which is a combination of Social Sciences and Humanities departments.

(3) A provisionally-admitted student will be required to register according to the published schedule and to participate in an orientation program at the time of registration. Provisionally-admitted students who register late have trouble getting into the right courses; they are behind schedule (particularly if they enter in the summer), and they miss out on any orientation that occurs at the beginning of the semester. The committee felt it is very important for provisionally-admitted students to begin classes at the appropriate time and to be here to register according to schedule, and it had been assured that the University could require them to do so.

(4) A provisionally-admitted student will be given only one chance to make the 2.0 grade-point average required for regular admission.

Currently, provisionally-admitted students who make a 1.5 in their first semester are allowed a second semester in which to bring their cumulative grade-point average up to at least 2.0; recent statistics indicate that the success rate among such students is only about 8%. The committee felt this does not do a particular service to the students involved and would be a desirable program to eliminate.

After only one request for clarification, the motion to substitute the Faculty Senate Committee recommendation for the Educational Policy Committee recommendation was ADOPTED by voice vote. Without further discussion, the substituted motion was then ADOPTED by voice vote.

At this time President Flawn departed, and Vice-President Livingston presided over the remainder of the meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE CONCERNING ADMISSION POLICIES FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS (D&P 8755-8772). (AMENDED, THEN POSTPONED AND REFERRED TO INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS AND STUDIES COMMITTEE)

On behalf of Billy V. Koen, Chairman of the 1981-1982 Admissions and Registration Committee, Shirley F. Binder (Director of Admissions) introduced the ten recommendations concerning admissions and registration policies for international students (D&P 8755-8772) and MOVED that they be approved by the University Council. The motion was seconded.

Joe W. Neal (Director, International Office) was then granted the privileges of the floor to speak on behalf of Joseph J. Moldenhauer (English), Chairman of the Standing Committee on International Programs and Studies, who was unable to be present, and Secretary Kelley distributed copies of a letter from Mr. Moldenhauer (Attachment A). Mr. Neal made the following remarks:

The International Programs and Studies Committee is an institutional policy or governance committee at the University. It is charged with developing and administering an educational program for Texas students who wish to study overseas for one or more semesters during, normally, their undergraduate years. The committee consists of members of the faculty at large, the area studies directors, and the Director of the International Office. Currently the committee is responsible for programs operating in Monterrey, Mexico; Lima, Peru; Sao Paulo, Brazil; Nice, France; and Wurtzburg, Germany. Approximately 25 Texans go abroad each year under the reciprocal arrangements for up to one year of study, for which they receive full University credit.

The committee makes two points concerning the international student admissions recommendations: (1) The Committee was not consulted during the preparation of this report. It would like to have had an opportunity to offer input on those aspects of the admissions policy which affect the University's ability to facilitate and negotiate education-abroad programs. (2) Even though the report recommends that the Office of Admissions be given exclusive rights concerning international student admissions, the committee would like to be involved in this process where it affects the acceptability of Texas students to overseas universities. The members of the International Programs and Studies Committee and area studies directors feel that they have a role to play in the admission decisions for these international students. If the University Council is willing to delay final consideration of the Admissions Committee recommendation, the International Programs and Studies Committee will study the recommendations of the Admissions Committee and suggest modifications of the report to recognize the responsibility of the International Studies and Programs Committee and the reciprocal exchange role of certain international students.

Dean Elspeth D. Rostow (LBJ School of Public Affairs) MOVED that, in Recommendation 8, the phrase "American-culturally biased" be replaced by the phrase "American-culturally oriented." She felt that, when used in connection with SAT and ACT examinations, there was a certain element of judgment in the word "biased" that she did not accept. The motion to replace was seconded.

James H. Sledd (English) opposed the motion; he thought that the SAT "is a culturally-biased test and has been proved to be so repeatedly."

Paul E. Begala (Student Representative) asked Ms. Binder why the committee said that the tests were culturally biased. Ms. Binder replied that the research concerning the test results of international students indicated that the test scores had to be interpreted in the context of the other information available on the students; even more than with American students, the test scores should not be interpreted alone. Mr. Begala concluded that, if the SAT and ACT scores are less indicative of future success for foreign students than they are for American-born students, then he agreed with Dr. Sledd that they are, de facto, culturally biased.

Barbara J. Dugas (Student Representative) disliked the phrase "American-culturally biased" because she thought the two examinations "are not even biased to all of us Americans; there are different cultures of America that these tests may be biased to." Joel F. Sherzer (Anthropology) added, "Anthropologists have a difficult time defining what American culture is for the reason that was just mentioned. For that reason I prefer the original wording, but I think it is correct that we should work on a third wording which is better than either one of the two proposals."

Parker C. Fielder (Law) stated, "Whether that test is regarded as American-culturally 'biased' or 'oriented' or 'slanted' or 'stacked' or whatever, we seem to be somewhat ashamed of the fact that it is. This test is a predictor. It is a predictor of people who will succeed in an American college which is culturally biased toward the United States of America. I am a little concerned that too little emphasis may be placed upon it as a predictor of success because the students, while they may lack sufficient orientation in U.S. culture, are going to be plunged into the middle of a university that is built on the U.S. culture, and will suffer as a result of it. I find nothing shameful about it. I think that if I were to take an equivalent SAT test in some other remote part of the world, I might find that it was biased against me because I was unfamiliar with the culture of that part of the world, and nevertheless it would be an accurate predictor of whether or not one would succeed in a college in that part of the world."

Mr. Sledd responded that the SAT "won't stand up as a predictor, either. If you look at the statistics which come from Educational Testing Service and CEEB, the best single predictor is the student's high school record, for people from this country. And the amount of accuracy which the SAT adds is very slight indeed, so you cannot defend it either as a really efficient predictor or as fair to different cultures. In this country, you can go down by 50's from 800, the top score, and you have a perfect point-by-point correlation with parental income. There is not a single exception.... Blacks normally score 100 points lower than whites, and among blacks in this country there has long been intense resentment of this test."

Dean Rostow pointed out, "The SAT was set up initially to try to reduce the amount of discrimination which individual universities and colleges could impose on applicants. It was very easy to find reasons to turn down candidates because of skin color or for other reasons. Thus the creation of a test which could be applied, and the results of which could be visible, without the degree of university or college slant was an effort to open doors, and it proved to be successful to that extent."

I would like to quote from the former Superintendent of Schools in Atlanta, a distinguished black educator named Alonzo Crim, who said that the SAT was one of the best ways that he had found to increase the possibility of acceptance by largely minority students in Atlanta to higher education; he felt that it would be the greatest dissatisfaction that he would have personally and the greatest harm that could be done to minority applicants were SAT scores to be discounted. He felt then that the anti-testing spirit which we have seen so widely discussed in recent years was largely an effort to reduce minority possibilities in recent to increase them, and he is not alone speaking in this fashion. I will not bother you with other quotes, but the effort then at creating some standard whereby applicants coming from different incomes and different backgrounds could be admitted was a step that was advocated by those who were favoring the opening of doors rather than closing them.

"I would like also to point out that [with] the SAT...we are talking about two approaches; one is...numerical, one is verbal. It is obvious that a test which requires familiarity with the English language will be harder for those for whom English is a second or a third language. In terms of the other side of the SAT, the mathematical side, this is a predictor of a capacity to survive in an increasingly quantitative world.

"I would suggest that the only reason I raised this is that I have regarded the history of the SAT in a different light than Mr. Sledd sees it. I see it rather as an effort to liberalize and to open higher education to many other different inputs within this country. He apparently sees it differently."

James W. Daniel (Mathematics) asked if the Rostow motion to replace was in order, and Vice-President Livingston ruled that it was. The motion that the phrase "American-culturally biased" be replaced by the phrase "American-culturally oriented" was then ADOPTED by voice vote.

Dean Robert C. Jeffrey (College of Communication) asked if it was accurate that the Admissions and Registration Committee had not consulted with the International Programs and Studies Committee during its deliberations. Ms. Binder replied that Mr. Neal, who is the administrative adviser to the International Programs and Studies Committee, was present at several different sessions of the Admissions and Registration Committee. Mr. Jeffrey then noted that he would prefer to have some input from Mr. Moldenhauer's committee before he voted on the motion to approve the recommendations from the Admissions and Registration Committee concerning admission policies for international students (D&P 8755-8772) be postponed until the November meeting of the University Council, and that, in the meantime, the recommendations be referred to the International Programs and Studies Committee for comment and recommendation. The motion to postpone was seconded.

Forest G. Hill (Economics) felt that, if there were to be a postponement, more thought should be given to the first recommendation, which would seem to grant total and unilateral power to the Office of Admissions.

The motion to postpone and refer was then ADOPTED by voice vote.

The Council then turned to the remaining items under NEW BUSINESS on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE HANDBOOK OF OPERATING PROCEDURES IN ORDER TO IMPROVE THE COMMUNICATION OF RELEVANT COURSE INFORMATION TO STUDENTS (D&P 8786). (REFERRED TO COMMITTEE OF COUNSEL ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY)

John D. Denson (Student Representative) presented the recommendation to improve the communication of relevant course information to students (D&P 8786) on behalf of the Student Representatives, who all helped draft the proposal and who all supported it strongly. He pointed out that the proposal had two requirements: (1) It would require a professor to communicate in written form to his or her students some basic information about what the course is planned to cover, some estimate of projected course work, and a statement of required and recommended textbooks for the class. (2) It would require a professor to notify his students about any changes that he might make in the information previously communicated in writing. The Handbook of Operating Procedures, in Section 3.22, now requires only that professors communicate to students information regarding final examinations and course grades; there is no provision that currently requires a professor to notify his students if he changes his mind about grading requirements. Mr. Denson stated that the Student Representatives feel that students in a class have a right to expect from the professor some statement about what the class is expected to cover. Most professors tend to furnish that information, but staff members of the Ombudsman's Office will attest to the fact that certain professors habitually do not do so, and problems arise in their classes. The proposal would also provide an opportunity to clear up at the beginning of the semester any miscommunication, as well as noncommunication, between the professor and his students as to what the class is supposed to be about.

Mr. Denson reminded members of the Council that about two years ago a Student Representative submitted a similar proposal. It was approved overwhelmingly by the University Council, but President Flawn vetoed it on the grounds that he felt the proposal was overly-legalistic and unduly restrictive; professors need flexibility in responding to changes in the course material. The six Student Representatives appreciated that point, so they had attempted to develop a new proposal that would satisfy that concern. However, staff members of the Ombudsman Office asked the Student Representatives to strengthen the proposal, so a Recommendation of the Ombudsman Office for Amending the Student Representatives' Recommendation had been prepared (Attachment B), and copies were distributed to members of the Council. Mr. Denson felt that the intent of the amendments was not to restrict the professor's academic flexibility any more than did the original proposal, and that the professor would still have the opportunity to change what he wanted to change.

Mr. Denson MOVED that the recommendation to amend the Handbook of Operating Procedures in order to improve the communication of relevant course information to students (D&P 8786) be approved by the University Council, and the motion was seconded. He then requested that privileges of the floor be extended to the Student Ombudsman, Deborah Stanton Burke, so that she could explain the proposed amendments, and floor privileges were so extended.

Deborah Stanton Burke (Student Ombudsman) stated that the proposal made by the Student Representatives was to the liking of her staff because, in addition to what Section 3.22 of the Handbook of Operating Procedures already required, they felt that a written course description should be given to the students by the end of the add/drop period; their amendments would leave John Denson's first paragraph (D&P 8786) unchanged. Their first amendment would be to the second paragraph, changing it to read as shown in Amendment 1 (Attachment B), stating that in most courses this requirement might be satisfied by the presentation to students of a course description in the form of a syllabus and giving detailed guidelines as to what the syllabus should include. However, she stressed that, "This is not binding language.... We have in mind the

fact that when President Flawn vetoed the legislation from last year, he felt that it was restricting a professor's judgmental decisions, restricting his academic creative freedoms, and we do not want to take those things away."

The third paragraph of the Student Representatives' proposal would remain unchanged. In the fourth paragraph, the word "convenient" would be changed to "possible." And finally, a new fifth paragraph would be added that said the written communication of relevant course information to students should be filed in the Departmental Office for each semester the course is taught.

Ms. Stanton Burke felt that there would be no implementation problems with these proposals. The departmental faculty is already charged with the responsibility of administering the Section 3.22 requirements, and these requirements in Section 4.07 would just be an addition. The requirements would not be rigid because they would not be binding. The professor would still have the same freedoms as before. Schedule changes would not be inhibited. She concluded by respectfully requesting that the Council adopt all three of the proposed amendments.

Members of the Council then MOVED and seconded that the University Council approve Amendment 1 from the Ombudsman Office (Attachment B).

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) stated that he would vote for the four paragraphs on D&P 8786. However, he had not even received the proposed amendments from the Ombudsman Office until he arrived for this meeting. He had not had enough time to study the amendments. He felt they were too detailed and that they insulted the intelligence of the faculty. He wanted to know how many students in the last year had complained about such matters to the Ombudsman.

Ms. Stanton Burke replied that Amendment 1 was just a list of guidelines as to the kinds of things that a professor should incorporate if he chose to utilize a syllabus for his course; nowhere did it say a professor was required to include all of these in his syllabus. In no way was this some kind of contractual agreement. And for statistics, the reason tardiness was put in was because there had been two students in her office who had lost points in their final grade in the course because they had been tardy, and they had not been told previously that tardiness was going to count off on their final grade. The Ombudsman Office sees about 2,500 students each year; about 20% of the problems are grade-dispute problems, and about half of those are syllabus-related problems.

David L. Phillips (Student Representative) pointed out once again that all the students wanted was a statement of some basic expectations that students could have. These were recommendations; they were not binding in any respect. All responsible faculty members let students know what to expect from their courses. There are a few faculty members, however, "who are not responsible and make this an uncomfortable place to study and to live. This recommendation is to address those few people, and I think that any effort that we can make to improve this community, however exponentially small it [might] be, should be undertaken...." Mr. Denson added that the Ombudsman's remarks implied that about 250 complaints to her office each year dealt with syllabus-related problems.

Mr. Iscoe asked why, if there has been dereliction of responsibility by faculty members, the Student Ombudsman Office had not brought that fact to the attention of the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, a committee elected by the faculty.

Stephen A. Monti (Associate Vice-President for Academic Planning) was extended the privileges of the floor. He asked for clarification concerning part B of Amendment 1, which said that Established Grading Criteria were "guidelines" and therefore either permissive or not so permissive depending on how the word "included" was interpreted. Currently

there is a mandated requirement for the undergraduate schools and colleges that the faculty member must submit the grading policies in writing to his students before the end of the add/drop period; would Amendment 1 supersede the current requirement and make it no longer mandatory but permissive?

John R. Durbin (Mathematics) asked Mr. Denson if he supported Amendment 1 as well as the original proposal; did he really think that the amendments were necessary, or would he feel relatively comfortable if the Council passed the original motion unamended? Mr. Denson replied that the Student Representatives had bent over backwards to try to make the original proposal as inoffensive as possible. Later on the Ombudsman Office staff pointed out things that would not have any more legal force than the original proposal but that might help clarify areas of student concern. All they wanted was a list of what students might be interested in hearing; problems with the wording could be resolved. He said that all six Student Representatives would unanimously and strongly support the Ombudsman Office amendments; on the other hand, if the choice was between the amendments and nothing, they would support the original proposal. They believed that some statement needs to be made; they would like the University Council to make that statement, and they would like the administration to ratify that statement.

R. Neill Megaw (English) asked for an answer to the question raised by Mr. Monti. Mr. Denson replied that Section 3.22 of the Handbook of Operating Procedures currently requires each professor to report to his students the final grading criteria. Amendment 1 would appear in the wording of the new Section 4.07, in which guidelines would be given as to what should appear, when applicable, in a course description with regard to grading criteria -- some of the things students would like to know about a professor's grading methods. He did not see any conflict between the requirement in Section 3.22 and the proposed guidelines in Section 4.07.

Claire E. Weinstein (Educational Psychology) MOVED the previous question, and the motion was seconded. The motion to close debate was ADOPTED by voice vote.

The motion to approve Amendment 1 (Attachment B) was then LOST by show of hands.

Members of the Council then MOVED and seconded that the University Council approve Amendment 2 from the Ombudsman Office (Attachment B).

Vice-President Livingston exercised the chair's privilege and suggested that the word "verbally" be changed to "orally," and the suggestion was accepted by the maker of the motion.

Forest G. Hill (Economics) MOVED to refer the recommendation from the Student Representatives and all three of the proposed amendments from the Ombudsman Office to the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility for consideration and recommendation to the University Council, and that the Committee should have interested parties come to discuss their proposals with the Committee before it reports back to the University Council. It seemed to him that the students were trying to suggest something far less than all professors should be doing in their courses. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Denson opposed the motion to refer and expressed his fear that the proposal might never come back to the Council from the Committee.

Mr. Iscoe supported the motion to refer and expected the proposal that would be returned by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility would be approved by the University Council.

Dean Robert C. Jeffrey (College of Communication), in order to allay any suspicion that the referral motion was an act to kill the proposal, MOVED to amend the motion to require that the Committee report at the next meeting of the University Council. Mr. Hill agreed to incorporate that requirement by adding the words "at its next meeting" to the end of his motion.

Dean Ronald E. Wyllys (Graduate School of Library and Information Science) suggested that the Ombudsman prepare a list of some of the most commonly-occurring troublesome complaints of this kind that result mainly from failure of faculty to think through actions and policy changes that they make with respect to class conduct, and that she circulate this list to the faculty in the form of a letter from the Ombudsman, simply pointing these out as common mistakes to avoid.

After some discussion, in which the possibility of asking the Committee to report back in December instead of November was rejected, the motion as modified by Mr. Hill was ADOPTED by voice vote.

PROPOSAL TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY TO APPROVE THE 1982-1983 DEGREE CANDIDATES (D&P 8787). (ADOPTED)

Secretary Kelley MOVED that, in accordance with the rules approved by the Board of Regents, the authority of the faculty to approve degree candidates for the academic year September 1, 1982, to August 31, 1983, be delegated to the respective deans. The motion was seconded, there was no discussion, and the motion was ADOPTED by voice vote.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES IN ORDER TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTION CONCERNING BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF UNIVERSITY CO-OP. (NO ACTION FOR LACK OF QUORUM)

Before the next item of New Business could be considered, David L. Phillips (Student Representative) MOVED that the Rules be suspended and that the Order of Business be changed to permit consideration of the following resolution concerning the Board of Directors of the University Co-op; and the motion was seconded:

The University Council resolves that the President of The University of Texas at Austin make known to his appointees on the Board of Directors of the University Co-Op that it is the sense of the Council that the Co-Op Board reconsider its move to change the name of the University Co-Op in light of questions concerning whether the requirement of a quorum was met at the time of the original vote on Monday, September 27, 1982; and

Be it further resolved that the President of The University of Texas at Austin should request that the Co-Op Board make known all anticipated financial and academic effects of the name change and that the President should communicate said effects to this body as information of vital interest to the academic community of The University of Texas at Austin herein represented.

Before discussion of the motion began, Ira Iscoe (Psychology) objected to the introduction of the resolution and asked if a quorum was still present. A count revealed the absence of a quorum, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Council will be held at 2:15 p.m. on Monday, November 15, 1982.

Distributed to members of the University Council and members of the General Faculty who want Minutes on December 8, 1982.

ATTACHMENT A

LETTER DATED OCTOBER 13, 1982, TO THE SECRETARY OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS AND STUDIES COMMITTEE

This is with reference to the material you distributed under Documents and Proceedings of the University Council, Pages 8755-8771 containing "Recommendations from the Admissions and Registration Committee Concerning Admission Policies for International Students."

I have read the Committee's report and recommendations, and offer, in behalf of the International Programs and Studies Committee, the following comments relevant to the deliberations of the Faculty Council scheduled for October 18, 1982.

In the first place, even though President Flawn apparently asked only the Admissions and Registration Committee to review the admissions policy for international students, we want it recorded that the Committee at no time consulted with the International Programs and Studies Committee during its deliberations. The International Programs and Studies Committee is an administrative committee of the University charged with the responsibility for developing exchange and study-abroad opportunities for The University of Texas at Austin. It includes in its membership, in addition to members of the faculty at large and student representatives, the directors of the area studies centers including the Institute of Latin American Studies, the Middle Eastern Center, the Center for Asian Studies, the European Studies Committee, and the Director of the International Office.

In developing education abroad programs, the Committee has frequently encountered aspects of the University's admissions policy toward international students which relate to its negotiations. We would like to see built into any formal statement of our international student admissions policy a recognition that our local admissions procedures bear on opportunities of Texas students to study in overseas universities. It is our recommendation that this be included in our international student admissions policy along with a recognition of the exchange and education-abroad responsibilities of the University.

If the University Council should decide to delay final consideration of the Admissions Committee's recommendations long enough to allow our committee to study these recommendations, we will be glad to suggest modifications of the report which will recognize the exchange role of international students. We could suggest these possible alterations either directly to the Admissions and Registrations Committee or submit them to you for review by the University Council.

/s/ Joseph J. Moldenhauer, Chairman

ATTACHMENT B

RECOMMENDATION OF THE OMBUDSMAN OFFICE FOR AMENDING THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES' RECOMMENDATION FOR IMPROVING THE COMMUNICATION OF RELEVANT COURSE INFORMATION TO STUDENTS

AMENDMENT 1.

The Ombudsman Office recommends this amendment to the Student Representatives' proposal to amend the second paragraph of proposed section 4.7 to read as follows:

In most courses, this requirement may be satisfied by the presentation of a course description in the form of a syllabus to students. When applicable, the course description, or syllabus, should include, but is not limited to [the general purpose for the course, required and recommended texts, and projected coursework.] the following guidelines:

- A. General Course Background, including
 - 1) Course name and number
 - 2) Instructor(s)
 - 3) Office number, hours, and mailbox location
 - 4) Required text(s) and materials
 - 5) Course prerequisites
- B. Established Grading Criteria, including
 - 1) Course requirements, such as
 - a) examinations and/or pop quizzes
 - b) papers
 - c) presentations
 - d) attendance
 - e) tardiness
 - f) readings
 - 2) The approximate weight of each course requirement
- C. A List of All Critical Dates of Administration of Class, including
 - 1) Approximate exam dates
 - 2) Final exam date
 - 3) Any field trips, special meetings, or exams held other than scheduled class meeting times
- D. Any Special Policies on
 - 1) Drops
 - 2) Incompletes
 - 3) Make-up examinations
 - 4) Time-extensions

AMENDMENT 2.

The Ombudsman Office recommends this amendment to the Student Representatives' proposal to amend the fourth paragraph of proposed section 4.7 to read as follows:

Course descriptions are not binding; changes of the course description information may be made verbally by the instructor at any time during the semester, provided that students are notified of the change as soon as it is ~~convenient~~ possible.

AMENDMENT 3.

The Ombudsman Office recommends this amendment to the Student Representatives' proposal by adding the following paragraph:

The written communication of relevant course information to students should be filed in the Departmental Office for each Semester the course is taught.

REASONS FOR THE AMENDMENTS

A very large number of conflicts between students and faculty members reported to the Ombudsman's Office result from a misunderstanding of the requirements and methods of evaluation for the course in which the conflict has arisen.

Our amendments would add to the Student Representatives' proposal a suggestion that instructors may present to students a course description or syllabus before the end of the add-drop period.

We then suggest what may be incorporated into the written course description.

The list of guidelines is not to be interpreted as a minimum or a maximum, it is only a suggested format.

Notice the word "may" is used throughout the proposed legislation. In legal jargon, the word "may" is not mandatory. It expressly means "that a decision to use or not to use is discretionary."

After listing the suggested guidelines to be incorporated into the course description or syllabus, we clearly state that such written communication need not take the form of a syllabus. Again, discretion is left to the instructor.

Also, clearly stated in the next paragraph is the fact that course descriptions are not binding. Changes may be made verbally by the instructor at any time, provided students are notified of the change as soon as it is possible. We prefer the word "possible" over "convenient." "Convenient" does not imply the timeliness that the word "possible" does. However, both words leave the time factor to the instructor's judgment.

The last paragraph of the proposal is the only one in which we've used the word "should." "Should" means something more definite, quite akin to "will," but it is not as definite as "must."

Since the responsibility for assuring adequate methods of evaluation rests with the departmental faculties, we thought it quite appropriate to include in our proposal the requirement that the course descriptions or syllabi be filed in the departmental offices each semester the course is taught. This will foster more efficient administration by the departments.

Hopefully, after a careful reading of the proposal and our amendments, it will be evident that there is no intent to infringe on the instructor's judgment or inhibit a choice to change his plans as originally stated.

Nor will this proposal raise any foreseeable implementation problems as each departmental office is already charged with the responsibility of insuring compliance with the written course requirement already in the Handbook of Operating Procedures, Chapter III, Section 3.22.