

DOCUMENTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

Following are the minutes of the regular Faculty Council meeting of November 16, 2015.



Hillary Hart, Secretary
General Faculty and Faculty Council

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING OF
NOVEMBER 16, 2015**

The third regular meeting of the Faculty Council for the academic year 2015-16 was held in the Main Building, Room 212 on Monday, November 16, 2015, at 2:15 PM.

ATTENDANCE.

Present: Meagan N. Abel, Gayle J. Acton, Arturo Arias, William Beckner, Chad J. Bennett, Carolyn M. Brown, Patricia L. Clubb, Stephanie W. Crouch, Elizabeth Cullingford, Ann Cvetkovich, Arturo De Lozanne, Catharine H. Echols, David R. Engleman, Amy S. Enrione, Gregory L. Fenves, Alan W. Friedman, Philip M. Gavenda, Sophia Gilmsen, Andrea C. Gore, Michelle Habeck, Marvin L. Hackert, Louis Harrison, Hillary Hart, Linda A. Hicke, Steven D. Hoelscher, Coleman Hutchison, Brent L. Iverson, Jody Jensen, Maria G. Juenger, Jonathan Kaplan, Kerry A. Kinney, Mary Knight, Judith Langlois, John C. Lassiter, Naomi E. Lindstrom, Timothy J. Loving, Lauren A. Meyers, Julia Mickenberg, Julie A. Minich, Jennifer Moon, Stephanie Mulder, Donald P. Newman, Gordon S. Novak, Patricia C. Ohlendorf, Sheila M. Olmstead, Na'ama Pat-El, Edward R. Pearsall, Jonathan T. Pierce-Shimomura, Nancy L. Roser, Stanley J. Roux, Cesar A. Salgado, David M. Schnyer, Rajashri Srinivasan, Zachary B. Stone, Emanuel Tutuc, David A. Vanden Bout, Kirk L Von Sternberg, Brian Wilkey, Karin G. Wilkins.

Absent: Dean J. Almy, Jay M. Bernhardt, Lance Bertelsen (excused), Lydia Maria Contreras, James H. Cox (excused), M. Lynn Crismon (excused), Douglas J. Dempster (excused), Randy L. Diehl, Andrew P. Dillon, David J. Eaton (excused), Bradley G. Englert, Veit F. Erlmann, Ward Farnsworth, Terrance L. Green (excused), Lorraine J. Haricombe, Barbara J. Harlow, Susan S. Heinzelman, Hans Hofmann (excused), S. Claiborne Johnston, Manuel Justiz, Susan L. Kearns (excused), Harrison Keller, Susan R. Klein, Daniel F. Knopf (excused), Desiderio Kovar (excused), David L. Leal (excused), Bradford R. Love (excused), Kelly McDonough (excused), Sharon Mosher, Rachel A. Osterloh, Gage E. Paine (excused), Dennis S. Passovoy (excused), Jorge A. Prozzi, Soncia Reagins-Lilly (excused), Vance A. Roper (excused), Christen Smith (excused), James C. Spindler (excused), Vincent S. (Shelby) Stanfield, Laura T. Starks, Frederick R. Steiner, Alexa Stuijbergen, Jessica R. Toste (excused), Gregory J. Vincent, Jo Lynn Westbrook (excused), Robert H. Wilson, Hannah C. Wojciehowski (excused), Sharon L. Wood, Cara Young (excused), Edward T. Yu (excused), Luis H. Zayas.

| | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Voting Members: | 49 present, | 27 absent, | 76 total. |
| Non-Voting Members: | 10 present, | 23 absent, | 33 total. |
| Total Members: | 59 present, | 50 absent, | 109 total. |

Chair Andrea Gore (professor, pharmacy) welcomed everyone and introduced a new member Zachary Stone, who replaced Xavier M Rotnofsky as the Student Government representative. Mr. Stone mentioned the debate between the president and vice-president of College Republicans and two officers from the University's Democrats on the implementation of Campus Carry. He remarked that he understood that this was something the Faculty Council members were extremely interested in and encouraged them to attend. The debate was held in Welch Hall, Room 2.224 from 7-9:00 PM.

I. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY (D 13559-13567).

Secretary Hillary Hart (distinguished senior lecturer, civil, architectural, and environmental engineering) reported that a memorial resolution committee had been formed to prepare a tribute to Professor Emeritus Austen F. Riggs (neuroscience) and that resolutions had been completed for Professors Emeriti Daniel S. Barker (geological sciences), Peter M. John (mathematics), David L. Huff (geography and environment), Hafez Farmavan (history), and Walter I. Fiery (sociology). The secretary reported that twenty-seven proposals were pending review by UT System and twenty-three were pending in the provost's office. Secretary Hart reminded members that sixteen proposals were pending Council review with a November 18 protest deadline. The secretary noted that two proposals from the Educational Policy Committee had been approved by no-protest on November 16 and had been transmitted to the president for review.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (D 13568-13605).

Secretary Hart asked for and received approval, with no objections or changes to the minutes of the regular meeting of the Faculty Council held October 19, 2015.

III. COMMUNICATION WITH THE PRESIDENT.

President Fenves apologized for having missed the last Faculty Council meeting having been in Washington, DC, attending the AAU annual meeting. Following events in the news at universities like Missouri, Yale, and Kansas, the president said he would first like to comment on issues around race, diversity, and inclusion to be followed by a brief update on Campus Carry.

President Fenves referenced his State of the University Address given in September where he stated, "excellence and diversity are very, very high priorities for me." He remarked that a lot of progress had been made over recent years, "but we have a lot more progress to make to be a truly diverse and inclusive campus environment." On the issue of diversity, the president mentioned that UT Austin would be back in the Supreme Court on December 9 defending an extremely important case for the University that would have national implications regarding the use of race and ethnicity in admissions—the case specifically has to do with undergraduate admissions. He remarked that seventy-seven friends of the court briefs representing hundreds of organizations, universities, and companies had been received supporting the University's position of using race and ethnicity as one factor of many in making holistic admission decisions. President Fenves stated, "We believe that we do this constitutionally following all of the previous Supreme Court precedence."

Related to the issue, the president said Senior Vice Provost Janet Dukerich had recently established a Council on Racial and Ethnic Diversity that would work to figure out how the University can continue to make progress diversifying, especially our faculty. "We need to redouble our efforts to make sure that we can continue to make progress."

Backing up a bit to talk about undergraduate admissions, President Fenves said thanks to the hard work in the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, the Office of Admissions, and the provost's office, the report for 2015 admissions indicated double digit increases in the percentage of African American and Hispanic freshmen, and "with focus, we can continue to make progress." However, the president said there were still issues on campus and that prior to the recent situation at the University of Missouri, he had begun making plans to meet with the presidents of Black student organizations on campus to open a dialogue on how we can continue to make progress for an inclusive and tolerant

campus environment. He stated that he would be calling on all of the faculty, department chairs, and deans as the University begins to develop plans for having these conversations across campus.

Speaking on Campus Carry, the president commented that SB11 had passed the weekend before he became president. He recalled his meeting with student leaders his first day as president saying that they were quite upset because they had worked very hard meeting with members of the legislature to express their opposition to having concealed weapons in buildings on campus. President Fenves remarked that concealed weapons have been allowed on the campus grounds for about twenty years, but the potential of allowing them in buildings is a very different situation. Like the students, Past President Bill Powers and he had worked with the legislature over the past session and were also disappointed that the law passed. In addition, he said that many parents had communicated to him that they are quite disturbed that individuals with concealed weapons would be allowed on campus and in buildings. The president acknowledged that Campus Carry is a very emotional and difficult topic and could potentially affect UT Austin's educational environment and that many people, including him, feel that it is not appropriate. Nevertheless, he said, "It is the law. I am obligated as the officer of the University to carry out the law the best way we can that's legally defensible."

President Fenves commended Professor Steven Goode (law) and the other eighteen members of the Campus Carry Working Group, who had been charged to develop recommendations on policies for implementing SB11. He commented that he was sure none of them had realized what the assignment would entail or how difficult it would be; yet all have willingly served. He hoped that everyone on campus would appreciate their hard work once their recommendations were released, sometime in early December. In the meantime, the president said that he had been and would continue talking with presidents from other public universities in the state to compare their approaches. Based on conversations to date, he opined that UT Austin's working group "is way ahead of what most other campuses are doing." President Fenves said he would be listening carefully to the dialogue later in the meeting on Campus Carry because "the Faculty voice is a very important part of this process." He stressed that this was not his choice, not the choice of most members of the campus community, but "We are going to have to work together to be able to implement and carry out the intent of the legislature as best as we can and preserve the precious educational environment we have here at The University of Texas."

The president then opened the floor for discussion and questions. Chair Gore reminded members to come up to the microphone and to give their name and department. She stated that nonmembers were granted permission to speak.

Concerning the diversity issues mentioned by the president and that also tied into SB11, Chair Elect Jody Jensen (professor, kinesiology and health education) asked whether he had considered broadening the meaning of diversity to include the LGBTQ community, international students, and students with physical disabilities, all of whom are affected differently by laws like Campus Carry. President Fenves acknowledged that it was a good question and confirmed that he wanted to include all individuals, but he had started first with the African American students because of recent events. He said his focus at the moment was where the attention would have the most impact, and then to expand beyond that. "I'm certainly aware that diversity has a broad definition and of course that's what we're defending in Fisher also."

D. Max Snodderly (professor, neuroscience and nutritional sciences) stated that he had been working with the legal group for GunfreeUT, and it appeared to them that there were wide discrepancies in how SB11 was being interpreted and its intent. He asked if there would be an opportunity for the campus community to comment on the working group's recommendations? President Fenves said there would be an opportunity to comment after the report is released. Professor Snodderly asked if the president would support establishing a center for studying gun violence and safety, to make something good come of this law? The president said he was open to any ideas of academic initiatives that add to the

educational environment. He added that this had also been a subject of discussion for the working group.

Na'ama Pat-el (associate professor, Middle Eastern studies) stated that she had met and heard from colleagues from all over the country who expressed their worry about guns in buildings on our campus, and how it would impact recruitment and retention of faculty and students. She opined that it would be more difficult to draw people to Austin. President Fenves reminded members that that was one of the crucial issues raised by Chancellor McRaven's when the law was being considered. The president said the provost's office would be monitoring recruitment and retention very closely and would work with the deans and department chairs to determine the impact of the law.

Michelle Habeck (associate professor, theater and dance) said that her department had begun the process of recruiting graduate students and that twelve of them had questioned what was happening with SB11. She said she did not have "a party line" or a place on the UT website where she could direct them to. She asked if there was a future plan to challenge the law, and if so, when would it start, if it had not already begun? President Fenves reiterated that the UT community would have an opportunity to comment on the working groups recommendations, which should be forthcoming in December, but definitive information about the specifics of the policy would not be available until after the Board of Regents' approval, which might occur in January. As a state employee, President Fenves said he could not directly challenge the law, but he expected that there would be non-University groups that would be considering that and that because it is a statewide issue, there would probably be legal challenges coming from both sides of the issue. He added, "I think it's going to be part of the political debate in the next legislative session."

Closing his comments, President Fenves thanked the Council for their attention.

IV. REPORT OF THE CHAIR—None.

V. REPORT OF THE CHAIR ELECT—None.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS—None.

VII. REPORTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY, COLLEGES, SCHOOLS, AND COMMITTEES—None.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS.

A. Resolution on Academic Freedom from the AAUP (D 13608).

Chair Gore invited Rajashri Srinivasan (chair, Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and professor, marketing administration) to present a resolution from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, which she read in its entirety. Afterwards, the Faculty Council unanimously endorsed the resolution

Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.
-1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*

1. Colleges and universities are a public good, not private profit-making institutions, and corporations or business interests should not dictate teaching or research agendas.
2. The life of colleges and universities should reflect all dimensions of human endeavor and be built on the full and open participation of diverse faculty and students.

3. The main aims of teaching are the dissemination of knowledge and the fostering of creativity; learning is not just about developing “job skills.”
4. The main aim of research is to create new knowledge, and academic freedom is essential for the free search for truth and its free expression. Research is not just about enhancing the profit margins of corporations.
5. After teaching and research, the third mission of colleges and universities is about engaging communities and addressing social disadvantage, and not just about “enterprise engagement” or “economic development.”
6. All who work at colleges and universities are entitled to a dignified and collegial workplace free of surveillance and authoritarian dictates and to resist the degradation of their working conditions.
7. Students are the next generation of enlightened and humane citizens, not just revenue streams or the bearers of collateral for unsustainable debt loads.
8. Information and communications technologies are welcome tools for teaching and research but should not be used to impoverish the quality of education or reduce faculty-student contact time.
9. College and university management should resist public education cutbacks and reverse the multiplying of senior management posts, many of which are unnecessary.
10. Faculty shared governance is the cornerstone of any college or university that values teaching and research. The authority of faculty in hiring decisions, promotions, and curricular matters should not be compromised by donors, trustees, or administrators. Similarly, the faculty voice in budgeting, institutional planning, and other internal operations should not be marginalized.

B. Campus Carry Resolution (D 13607).

Chair Gore explained that the FCEC and a few other members of the Faculty Council had met twice for one and one half hour meetings and exchanged more than 115 emails drafting the resolution that had been disseminated to the Council members on November 6. Chair Gore then read the resolution, which had since been slightly modified to correct a grammatical error:

The Mission of The University of Texas at Austin is to achieve excellence in undergraduate education, graduate education, research and public service and to contribute to the advancement of society through research, creative activity, scholarly inquiry and the development of new knowledge. The Faculty Council asserts that the University cannot fulfill this mission if guns are allowed in educational facilities. We believe that, by creating an uneasy and potentially hostile environment for intellectual inquiry, guns in educational spaces impede learning, honest evaluation, and academic freedom, and jeopardize the quality and reputation of the University. Therefore, the Faculty Council strongly opposes allowing guns in The University of Texas at Austin classrooms, laboratories, residence halls, university offices, and other spaces of education.

Past Chair Bill Beckner (professor, mathematics) made a motion to accept the resolution, which was then seconded. Professor Beckner remarked, “This is exactly what we should be doing. We represent the faculty. We were elected to serve on this Council. The Faculty Council should have a voice as some of our colleagues said two meetings ago, and this seems to be straightforward.”

Ms. Megan Abel (Senate of College Councils representative) pointed out that the majority of deaths as a result of firearms were actually suicides as opposed to homicides. She expressed hope that the Faculty Council would take some of its energy for Campus Carry and look at the role of mental health at our institution, especially for undergraduates. She opined “There is a big intersection with the issue of firearms and the role that they play in mental health issues.”

Professor Pat-El opined that the resolution could have been issued by anyone as it didn't mention all of the worries that had been raised by the Council at this and previous meetings, particularly about recruitment and the image and reputation of the University. Chair Gore pointed out that the resolution states "and jeopardize the quality and reputation of the University." Professor Pat-El responded saying the resolution was very general, and she felt that it needed to specify the direct consequences of the bill. Professor Pat-El opined that the resolution should mention specifically the problems the bill would cause with recruitment and retention and its impact on the quality of this institution. Chair Gore asked if she wanted to propose an amendment, and Secretary Hart asked what language she would want to use and noted that it would then need to be voted on. Chair Elect Jensen stated that she didn't believe that this resolution was the place to actually list all of the specifics. She pointed out that a large number of departments had prepared written statements, many of which were based on their expertise and knowledge. She agreed that a lot of the issues like mental health and recruitment and retention needed to be addressed, but in a separate document such as a white paper that could be more informative as to why so many members of the campus community were standing in opposition to the law. "I think it's important the faculty go on record to say we are in opposition to what the expansion of guns on campus will do to the educational environment for students and faculty alike." Professor Pat-El countered saying "I think the problem is that this is a body that represents the entire faculty, which means that if anything is going to be quoted in the press, it's going to be this resolution." She stated that nobody would read all of the departmental statements. Instead, she said citizens of Texas would be looking for a statement issued by the University. She hoped that they would see that we are looking to the future and can foresee the decline of this institution as a result of implementation of SB11.. She opined that if the resolution were to be approved as written, many would say, "Wow, a bunch of liberals who don't like guns on campus," which she said is not the problem. She said, "The problem is that there are going to be consequences because of this bill, whether you like guns or not."

Sophia Gilmsen (associate professor, music) said that she would actually like the resolution not to list specific spaces where guns would be prohibited, i.e. classrooms, laboratories, residence halls, and University offices. She worried that some "smart alec" could claim to be able to have a gun in a "bathroom" because that word is not listed. Secretary Hart worried that not having a list of specific indoor places where guns would be prohibited would cloud things since they have been allowed on campus for twenty years, just not in buildings.

Professor Pat-El suggested adding faculty recruitment and retention to the sentence "We believe that by creating an uneasy and potentially hostile environment for intellectual inquiry, guns in educational spaces impede learning, honest evaluation, academic freedom, and jeopardize the quality and reputation of the University."

Chair Gore agreed that the law would impede recruitment and retention, but since there were no statistics yet, she expressed concern for including it as an assertion. Professor Pat-El countered saying "We do not know if there will be a problem with honest evaluation either. We don't know any of this. This is our fear right? This is something that we want to say—that this is going to be a problem." Julia Mickenberg (assistant professor, American studies) asked if the amendment could include students, Professor Pat-El agreed. The amended sentence would read

We believe that by creating an uneasy and potentially hostile environment for intellectual inquiry, guns in educational spaces impede learning, honest evaluation, academic freedom, recruitment and retention of faculty and students, and jeopardize the quality and reputation of the University.

Professor Cvetkovich commended the FCEC for preparing and presenting the resolution. She said, "It may not say everything but I think it quite elegantly hits some key points. It is so important to assert the power of faculty governance around this issue." She also encouraged all Faculty Council

members to become even more active in addressing this issue in whatever way seemed appropriate. Professor Cvetkovich expressed her sadness to hear President Fenves suggest that as a state employee, he could not fight the law.

As citizens, as members of this community, although it's kind of a catch 22, we need to recognize the importance of freedom and ability to determine the nature of our work places. So I think it is very important to align this with issues of academic freedom and the work that AAUP is doing to talk about the politics and the economics of education at this time.

Professor Cvetkovich received an enthusiastic round of applause in appreciation of her statements. Afterwards, there was a motion to accept the amendment; it was approved with one abstention.

Coleman Hutchison (FCEC member and associate professor, English) asked if staff should be included? He remarked that it would have been more elegant to have only inserted recruitment and retention since it would have encompassed everyone, including faculty, students, and staff. The Council then voted to amend the resolution further by adding "and staff." The second amendment was also approved unanimously.

Finally, the twice-amended resolution was opened for further discussion. Professor James Galbraith (professor, LBJ school and non-Council member) expressed his "very strong support for the spirit of this resolution and to associate myself with all of the comments that have just been made." He stated that the law is a threat to the University and that "the political leadership of the state needs to understand the damage they have done and to be made aware of the necessity for the future of the state that this damage be undone." Hearing no further comments on the resolution, the Faculty Council voted unanimously to approve it. The transcript of the discussion is in [Appendix A](#).

C. Proposed New Computational Engineering Degree Plan (D 13373-13380).

Gerald Speitel (associate dean for academic affairs, Cockrell School of Engineering) presented a proposed new degree plan in the Cockrell School of Engineering designed to combine fundamental engineering principles with advanced knowledge of mathematics, computational methods and programming techniques (See [Appendix B](#)). The associate dean said the goal was to put the school in the forefront of engineering education as engineering design becomes more computationally intensive and to meet the instructional and computational engineering demands of the students. He stated that the new degree program would expand job opportunities for students "in meeting and growing industry demand for engineers with computational backgrounds." He said the program would complement the existing graduate program in computational science, engineering, and mathematics, which is run in collaboration with the College of Natural Sciences through the Institute for Computational Engineering and Sciences (ICES).

In terms of implementation and impact, Dr. Speitel said the school anticipated no net change in the enrollment of undergraduates since the Departments of Aerospace Engineering and Mechanical Engineering would allow their numbers to decrease as the new degree program numbers increased. As a result, he said there would be little impact on most natural science courses taken by engineering students, and the departmental and school budgets would not be affected. However, he did say the faculty teaching assignments would need to be adjusted. Dr. Speitel said the proposal had been vetted and approved by the College of Natural Sciences and that the aerospace engineering faculty had overwhelmingly supported it. And both the Cockrell School of Engineering Degrees and Courses Committee and the Cockrell School of Engineering faculty had unanimously approved it. He said the goal was to launch the new program in fall 2017. He then opened the floor for discussion and questions.

Professor Beckner asked if the school had an idea of the number of students who might enroll in the program in five to six years? Dr. Speitel said they anticipated approximately 150 to 200

students and that from the school's perspective, it would be a relatively small engineering program. Hearing no further questions, the Faculty Council voted unanimously to approve the new degree program.

D. AAUP Joint Statement Opposing "Campus Carry" Laws (D 13609).

Chair Gore invited Chair Elect Jensen to present a statement from the AAUP expressing her hope that the Council would join in on adopting the joint statement. She read the statement as follows:

The horrific shootings at Umpqua Community College in Oregon and subsequent incidents of gun violence elsewhere have prompted renewed efforts to keep our colleges and universities both safe and open. One measure increasingly proposed is legislation—already approved in eight states—that would allow any licensed gun owner to carry concealed weapons on campus. Advocates of such so-called "Campus Carry" legislation contend that the presence of weapons in classrooms and other campus facilities will deter those seeking to wreak violence. Oregon is one state where "Campus Carry" is legal, but that did not prevent the tragedy.

Colleges and universities closely control firearms and prohibit concealed guns on their campuses because they regard the presence of weapons as incompatible with their educational missions. College campuses are marketplaces of ideas, and a rigorous academic exchange of ideas may be chilled by the presence of weapons. Students and faculty members will not be comfortable discussing controversial subjects if they think there might be a gun in the room.

William McRaven, chancellor for the University of Texas system and a former member of the Navy SEALs who rose to the rank of admiral, opposed passage of "Campus Carry" legislation in his state. "I feel the presence of concealed weapons will make a campus a less-safe environment," he said. "If you have guns on campus, I question whether or not that will somehow inhibit our freedom of speech. If you're in a heated debate with somebody in the middle of a classroom and you don't know whether or not that individual is carrying, how does that inhibit the interaction between students and faculty?"

The undersigned organizations strongly support efforts to make college campuses as safe and weapon-free as possible for students, faculty, staff, parents, and community members. We therefore oppose efforts to enact "Campus Carry" laws and call for their repeal where they already exist. We encourage colleges and universities to embrace critical incident planning that includes faculty and staff and to advise all faculty and staff of these plans. We further call on these institutions to rely on trained and equipped professional law-enforcement personnel to respond to emergency incidents. State legislative bodies must refrain from interfering with decisions that are properly the responsibility of the academic community.

The signatories include: American Association of University Professors, American Federation of Teachers, the Association of American Colleges and Universities and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

With this I submit this statement ask that The University of Texas approve and adopt.

Following a motion to endorse the statement, Chair Gore opened the floor for discussion. Professor Snodderly announced that last year, he had receive a letter from the president of AAUP pointing out that The University of Texas at Austin had been home to one of the association's

original chapters and asked for assistance in reviving the chapter during AAUP's centennial year. He opined that it seemed "appropriate to endorse the resolution that the AAUP has negotiated through these prestigious bodies and to ask if we can consider reviving our chapter in this august organization." Chair Gore said she would like the Council to vote on the statement first, then they could discuss reviving the chapter. Professor Mickenberg strongly supported the statement and asked if other universities were also voting to support it? Chair Elect Jensen said she did not know, but she and Chair Gore would share the statement and the Council's action with members of the Texas Council of Faculty Senates and the UT System Faculty Advisory Council. Professor Beckner remarked that the resolution came out on November 12 and said, "It was fortuitous for us to have a meeting today so we could immediately bring it up. And other groups involved on this effort on campus have posted this message too." No further questions or comments were forthcoming. The Council voted unanimously to adopt the resolution.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMENTS.

Before adjourning the meeting, Chair Gore asked if there were any further comments? Alan Friedman (professor, English) responded to the question raised earlier in the meeting about the AAUP presence on campus. As a former member of the National Council of the AAUP, former chair of the National Committee on Governance, and former president of the UT Chapter of AAUP for many years, he said it had been difficult to sustain an AAUP presence on campus since there had been little interest on the part of the administration or the faculty. In light of the AAUP's support of what is happening on our campus, he thought it would be an excellent idea for faculty to consider reviving the chapter. Professor Beckner commented that for the past six to ten years, former Council and FCEC member, Brian Evans (professor, electrical and computer engineering), had been promoting faculty engagement with the AAUP. Chair Gore remarked that this was not something that needed to go through the Faculty Council, and added that if Professor Snodderly was willing to be the point person for people who are interested, that might be a good way to get started. Professor Snodderly responded saying that Patricia Somers (associate professor, educational administration) who is a member on one of the executive boards of the Texas AAUP had been preparing paperwork to reinstitute the chapter at UT Austin. He invited interested members to contact either Dr. Somers or him to enroll. He added that there was an important legal reason for reviving the chapter. He pointed out that belonging to a chapter of a nationally recognized organization such as AAUP would give faculty good standing to challenge SB11.

In closing, Chair Gore thanked members for attending the meeting. She opined that the Faculty Council had been given a unique opportunity to pass three resolutions where the timing and juxtaposition were historical.

- A. College of Liberal Arts *Undergraduate Catalog* proposals protest deadline is November 18.
- B. The next Faculty Council meeting will be December 7 at 2:15 PM in Main 212.

X. QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR—None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting adjourned at 3:18 PM.

[Appendix A](#)

**Excerpts from the Transcription of the Campus Carry Discussions
Faculty Council Meeting, November 16, 2015, MAI 212**

Andrea Gore, chair, professor, pharmacy

Welcome to the Faculty Council meeting. Where is Hillary? Did she just step out? Oh no! Well I'll get her slide set up. Let's see if there is anything I can do while we're waiting for Hillary. Is Zach Stone here? Zach, come on up. We'll take advantage of having a minute. Zach is here, he's one of our students and he's here to make an announcement.

Zachary Stone, Student Government

Thank you. I just recently replaced Xavier Rotnofsky as the student appointee to Faculty Council from Student Government. This evening through Student Government, I am moderating a debate between the president and vice-president of College Republicans and two officers from the Universities Democrats on the implantation of Campus Carry and I just, obviously, know that that is something the Faculty Council is incredibly invested in, has very strong feelings about. So I encourage you if you're interested in hearing the student perspective on it and how the law should be implemented, on how we think certain problems should be addressed, I encourage you to come out. It will be in Welch Hall in room 2.224 from 7 to 9pm this evening. So thanks so much.

Gore

Thanks so much Zach. Hillary? We're ready for you for the Secretary's Report. No time to get water.

Hillary Hart, secretary of the General Faculty, senior lecturer, civil architecture and environmental engineering

Hi, so as Secretary, I want to give you this short report. A memorial resolution committee has been formed for Professor Emeritus Austen Riggs in neuroscience. We have received resolutions for the people listed on the slide and we'll act on those promptly.

Items of legislation, there's an update to the core curriculum course list which the Faculty Council approved at the last meeting and that has been put through to the Provost and the UT System have approved it and it's now pending the higher action of The Higher Education Coordinating Board. There are a bunch of new proposals pending at UT System, 27, and 23 pending in the Provost's office. Again, this is a journey they all have to take and then they are on their way. Then there's 16 pending your approval, the Council approval. So take a look at those please, the deadline is November 18th so if you see any problem with any of those, you will want to protest before that date. Since it's November 16, because of no protest on your part, you've approved the two Educational Policy proposals, some of you may recall those. I can tell you about them if you want to know.

Alright so let's move on to approving the minutes. As has become customary, I would like to ask for any objections, or emendations or additions to those minutes? Since I don't hear or see any, I will consider them approved. Any questions for me? Thank you.

Gore

Thanks, Hillary. We'll now have time to hear from our president. President Fenves.

President Fenves

Okay, thank you Andrea. I'm sorry I missed the last Faculty Council meeting, I can't remember which trip to Washington I had to be at, but I think it was the AAU annual meeting which is important for The University of Texas. A lot going on. Let me just talk about two issues and then see if there are questions. The two issues I would like to talk about, the issues around race, diversity and inclusion; we've been reading about it, following it at universities like Missouri, Yale, University of Kansas and another number of universities around the United States. So I want to say a few comments about that and then the second is, I know it's going to be on your agenda later for the meeting, I want to give you an update on Campus Carry from my perspective.

I think we've all been following these events around the country in higher education in American universities as I stated in my State of the University address in September, excellence and diversity are very, very high

priorities for me. We have made a lot of progress in this university, especially over recent years on many things that President Bill Powers had begun but we have a lot more progress to make to be a truly diverse and inclusive campus environment.

A couple of things that we're working on, so first of all, on the issue of student diversity we will be back in the Supreme Court December 9th defending the use of race and ethnicity in Undergraduate Admissions, actually admissions overall, but the case specifically has to do with undergraduate admissions. This is an extremely important cause for the University of Texas; it has national implications. We've received, I think it's about 77 friends of the court briefs representing hundreds of organizations, universities and companies including the U.S. military, private companies, many, many universities and the solicitor general representing the United States supporting our position of using race and ethnicity as one factor of many in making holistic admission decisions. We believe that we do this constitutionally following all of the previous Supreme Court precedence. We've prevailed with the trial court and twice with the court of appeals so we are back in the Supreme Court for a second time, defending this position in Washington on December 9th along with the Legal team and a number of other representatives of the University.

One of the things that I started as Provost last year working with Janet Dukerich, our Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs is establishing for the first time a council on racial and ethnic diversity. That council is now been established, this is not just another bureaucratic mechanism but a place to figure out how we can continue to make progress in diversifying, especially our faculty. I spoke with the deans this morning about it and we need to redouble our efforts to make sure that we can continue to make progress.

Let me back up actually, I'm going a little too fast on undergraduate admissions. We did report our fall 2015 admissions and thanks to the hard work in the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement and the Office of Admissions and the Provost Office, we did see with some additional recruiting and retention and how we're working with prospective applicants. We saw a double digit increase in the percentage of African American and percentage of Hispanic freshman, so that is an indication with commitment and with focus that we can continue to make progress. There's still issues on campus, there's no question about that. I've talked with a number of students, many others, and one of the things we started doing last week (and actually this had been in planning prior to the University of Missouri situation) I'll start meeting especially with the Presidents of the Black Students Associations, Black Students Organizations, to begin to make sure that we do have an open dialogue on how we can continue to make progress as an inclusive and tolerant campus environment. So I'm very pleased with the commitment with everybody I've spoken with up to this point and I'm going to be calling on all of the faculty and certainly department chairs and deans as we start to develop plans for doing this across the campus.

Second area is campus carry, I spoke with you early, soon after I started as President, about this. We were just beginning the process as a result of the passage of SB11 in the legislature; that law passed just the weekend before I became President. I remember very distinctly meeting with student leaders, my first day as President, and they were quite upset. They had worked quite hard as student organizations in working with the legislature and meeting with members about their opposition to having concealed weapons in buildings on campus. I think everybody knows by now that concealed weapons have been allowed on campus grounds for about 20 years but it's a very different situation when there's a potential for them being allowed in buildings. The students had worked quite hard and were disappointed. I was disappointed too. We have worked with the legislature over the past session, I was Provost at the time and I know Bill had worked with them and we were disappointed that the law passed.

I've talked with many parents, parents of our students who are also quite disturbed that starting next year there may be individuals with concealed weapons on campus. I know it's a very difficult topic, it's a very emotional one it's emotional for me to think that weapons on campus could have the potential for affecting an educational environment. I think most people, not all, but most people on our campus community, including myself, feel that that's not appropriate. Nevertheless as I spoke with Faculty Council earlier this summer, it is the law. I'm obligated as the officer of the University leading it to carry out the law the best way we can that's legally defensible and reflects the fact that this is what the legislature at this time has decided. [11:48]

I want to commend Steve Goode and UT Law School and the other 18 members of the Working Group. I don't think any of them realized when I asked them to serve on that working group, to develop recommendations on policies for implanting SB11, exactly what this would entail. I can see when I talk with them, just the look in their eyes that this is a really difficult, difficult assignment. None of them turned it down when I asked them to do it, they all willingly served and I think everybody on campus, I hope, will recognize that when they present their recommendations. We will release the recommendations; they haven't decided exactly when that will be but I expect it will be in early December. In the meantime I have been talking with university presidents, presidents of other public universities in Texas. Comparing, talking about our approaches and I think our Working Group is way ahead of what most other campuses are doing, at least based on my conversations with the other presidents. I think that we, a lot of people will be looking at these recommendations and recognizing that there's some important trade offs in how we make the policies in where guns are prohibited on campus. Along with policies on safety and, I think, the laws will be some general recommendations on policy implementation having to do with enforcement of campus policies with respect to SB11.

So I know it's going to be on the agenda for the meeting later today, I will listen carefully. Faculty voice is very important as part of this process and ultimately, my decision in making the decision is subject to the Board of Regents modification. The faculty voice is very, very important but I want to leave it with you that this was not my choice. Oops, I'm sorry, I shouldn't play with buttons. This was not my choice, not the choice of most members of the campus community but we're going to have to work together to be able to implement and carry out the intent of the legislature as best we can and preserve the precious educational environment we have here at The University of Texas.

So I see a few members of the Campus Working Group here and I can see it in their eyes. So with that, I'll stop and I don't know if you want me to answer questions or take questions.

Gore

So if you come up to the mic, please give your name and your department. If you're not in Faculty Council, let us know so we can give you permission to speak.

Jody Jensen, chair elect, professor kinesiology and health education

I'd like to ask you actually about the diversity plan and workforce. So I understand that there's been a lot of discussion nationwide, as you've noted, and with the taskforce here, you mentioned meeting with students and people associated with you know, black student organizations. I also wonder about broadening the sense of diversity and reaching out to those, whether it's gay and lesbian, transgender, whether it's international students who come, who are differently affected by laws like campus carry. But it seems to me that we could broaden the notion of what we're looking at when we talk about diversity -- even students with physical disabilities. So how do they get wrapped up into you know, this plan?

Fenves

Yeah, that's a good question. Of course we want to have a broad definition for all individuals, there are even a few groups you left off your list. But I wanted to start with the African American students because I think that has been what is getting a lot of attention and deservedly attention. Part of working with the Vice President Vincent, working with the Provost Office, is how we develop the right policies for all elements of diversity. I also like to focus where the attention can have the most impact in the moment and then we can expand beyond that. But I'm certainly aware that diversity has a broad definition and of course that's what we're defending in Fisher also.

Max Snodderly, professor, neuroscience and nutritional sciences

I've been working hard with the legal group from Gun Free UT looking at the issues and it appears there are wide discrepancies among people's interpretations of just exactly what the law means so that's a lot of latitude and in that spirit, will there be an opportunity for comment and consideration on the Working Group's recommendations?

Fenves

Yeah, so we will release the Working Group's report prior to me making my final decision, so there will be an opportunity to comment after the Working Group report is released.

Snodderly

Okay, one other question. If we could make something positive out of this situation, there's been a lot of discussion among people about establishing a center for a study of gun violence and personal safety at UT that would take a look at alternatives to having guns in every possible corner of the universe. Would you as president, support such an initiative.

Fenves

So I'm open to any ideas on academic initiatives that add to the educational environment and I know this has been a subject of discussion for the Working Group also. Thank you.

Na'aam Pat-El, associate professor, Middle Eastern studies

I've met a lot of colleagues in the last few months from all over the country and the people who know about our problems here with the guns, all express worry and I'm wondering because you mentioned how you talked to students and parents of students but I know a lot of people raise the issues of retention and recruitment. Not only of students but of faculty, and I would like to see that addressed, because the problem ... I don't see the problem as having multiple shooters out here, that is very unlikely to happen, but it's very unlikely also to be able draw people to come to Austin.

Fenves

And that was, remember, Chancellor McRaven's early statements; when the law was being considered he certainly did bring up the crucial issue of faculty recruitment and retention. This is something that we are monitoring; the Provost office will be monitoring and working with deans and department chairs as we're always working very hard on faculty recruitment and retention. It will be something that we're going to keep track of. The SB11 allows a process for periodic updates of the implementation and we need to set up monitoring of the implementation, and the recruitment and retention of faculty, students and staff is something that we are going to need to monitor to determine what the impact is. [19:51]

Michelle Habeck, associate professor, theatre and dance

I think I just broke this, there we go. So this ties right in to recruitment and retention but we are, in our area, moving into the recruitment of incoming graduate students and I have found already, I've had 12 students contact me, many of them from out of the country, wanting to know exactly what is going on with SB11. I don't have a party line, or a place, location on the UT website in which to go and say, this is what's happening, this is how it's going to affect you. And all other questions from the students and it's also my own, is there any future plan to challenge this law? And if so, when would that start or is it already in the works or...?

Fenves

So two questions. The impact hasn't been sighted yet; we need to get the Working Group to report out their recommendations as I mentioned earlier, then the opportunity for comment, and I'll be making my decision on what those policies are, subject to Board approval. That may not happen until January of next year, just because of the holidays coming up but that's when we'll have definitive information about what the specifics of the policy ought to be.

Second question, was?

Habeck

Second question was, will there be a challenge..?

Fenves

Will there be a challenge? Well as a state employee, I can't directly challenge the law, I expect that there will be non-university groups that are going to be looking at it and that's party of the democratic process. Again, talking with a number of people, faculty, students in particular, parents of students, I think this may very well be a statewide issue. It doesn't affect just us, it affects every public university. I'm sure there will be legal challenges, probably on both sides and then I think it's going to be part of the political debate in the next legislative section. Alright, thank you.

Gore

Okay, so next on the agenda is a resolution; as I told you, the FCEC and some additional Faculty Council members met twice at one and a half hour meetings and we probably had another 115 emails. We posted the resolution this last week; we did make a very minor, grammatical wording change since then, but this is identical to what you all saw other than that wording change. I would like to read it to you now and then I ask for a motion and a second to approve it and then have discussion.

“The Mission of The University of Texas at Austin is to achieve excellence in undergraduate education, graduate education, research and public service and to contribute to the advancement of society through research, creative activity, scholarly inquiry and the development of new knowledge. The Faculty Council asserts that the University cannot fulfill this mission if guns are allowed in educational facilities. We believe that, by creating an uneasy and potentially hostile environment for intellectual inquiry, guns in educational spaces impede learning, honest evaluation, and academic freedom, and jeopardize the quality and reputation of the University. Therefore, the Faculty Council strongly opposes allowing guns in The University of Texas at Austin classrooms, laboratories, residence halls, university offices, and other spaces of education.”

So is there a motion to approve?

Bill Beckner, professor, mathematics

I move that we approve this resolution.

Gore

Second? Okay. Discussion?

Beckner

I think this is exactly what we should be doing. We represent the faculty, we were elected to serve on this council, Faculty Council should have a voice, as some of our colleagues said two meetings ago, and this seems to be straightforward.

Gore

Thank you. Other comments?

Megan Abel, student, Senate of College Councils

I'm one of the student representatives on Faculty Council, I just wanted to bring to your attention that the majority of deaths as a result of firearms are actually suicides as opposed to homicides and it's my hope that the Faculty Council will, can take some of this energy that has been put toward this Campus Carry resolution and really look at the role of mental health at our institution. It's a big problem for undergraduates especially and again, there's a big intersection with this issue of firearms and the role that they play in mental health issues. Thank you.

Pat-El

I think it's a little weak, we don't talk at all, we don't mention all the worries we raised here in the previous meeting and again about recruitment, about the image of the University and about what it's going to do to its reputation. It doesn't mention that at all. This could have been issued by any one person.

Gore

It says, “and jeopardize the quality and reputation of the University.”

Pat-El

But I mean, that's very general. I mean, I think we need to specify what are going to be the consequences. In order to have any effect for people to see, there are very direct consequences for this bill.

Gore

So are you proposing an amendment?

Pat-El

I think we should mention specifically the problem with attracting people, good people to UT and maintaining the quality of this institution.

Gore

So you want something in there about recruitment and retention?

Pat-El

Correct. Which was something that was mentioned by a lot of people the last time.

Hart

If you are suggesting an amendment, we need specifics; you need to come up with the amendment yourself and then we could vote on that. (**Pat-El**: Right now you mean?) You can't just send this back to the drawing board; we won't be able to vote today if we do that.

Gore

So I was going to suggest if you could take a look at the wording and see where do you think that would go. We'll work with you, to help you, not to put you on the spot.

Hart

Then we'll need to show it to the whole, to everybody.

Gore

Right, then the amendment gets voted on.

Hart

Just to clarify.

Gore

Jody, were you going to try to help?

Jensen

Actually, I was going to try and address your concern about the specifics. I don't believe that this resolution is the place to actually list all the specifics. One of the things that we have been blessed with in some ways is I guess the number of departments who have written departmental statements from the basis of their expertise and acknowledged, just as our student rep indicated, mental health is a huge issue, 30% of college students are on anti-anxiety or anti-depressants. Student judicial services made a statement that you know, someone, or that they anticipate just because of the lack of challenge that many students have faced that their cognitive ability to wrestle with disconcerting experiences, is like that of a 14 or 15 year old not the chronological age of students here. So a lot of these issues here have to be addressed but I think a separate document, a separate white paper that would outline this information would then also be distributable and would be more informative for why is it that we just stand in such great opposition.

I think it's important the faculty go on record to say we are in opposition to what the expansion of guns on campus will do to the educational environment for students and faculty alike.

Pat-El

I think the problem is that this is a body that represents the entire faculty which means that if anyone is going to be quoted in the press it's going to be this resolution. This is very general. No body is going to go around reading all of the letters from all of the departments; if, for example, the citizens of Texas are going to look at something the University has issued it's going to be this. And I want to tell them what they are going to see in the future; they are going to see the decline of this institution and they may really, really care about that. If we send this, they say wow, a bunch of liberals don't like guns on campus, and that's not the problem. The problem is that there is going to be consequences for this bill. Whether you like guns or not.

Gore

So I haven't heard an amendment yet. Sorry. Are you going to speak on the same issue or a similar issue?

Sophia Gilmson, associate professor, music

Similarly different. I never speak at these meetings or any meetings. This is a very hard issue as everyone has indicated. I am truly, would like to hear a little bit less specific in the University of Texas at Austin classrooms, laboratories, residence halls, University offices and as the spaces of education, and all of this is very fine. I think it is very unified emotions that we should not have guns at the University anywhere. Anywhere. What if some smart [inaudible] in the bathroom, that is not mentioned there. So I actually would like it see a less specific list, simply stating, "not allowed at The University of Texas at Austin." Probably my last speech at this meetings.

Gore

Thank you. So that sounds like an amendment.

Hart

Then actually what you're speaking to, Sonia? Sophia isn't just SB11 because guns have been allowed as President Fennes said on campus for about 20 years outside of buildings. So you'd be pushing against two things; it might cloud things, that's my worry.

Pat-El

Someone in the audience gave me this, I don't know who, but (Gore: Can you speak into the microphone?) Sorry, a member of the audience gave me this suggestion and recommendation and I think it works very well. We believe that creating an uneasy and potentially hostile environment for intellectual inquiry. Guns in academic spaces impede learning, honest evaluation. We can add faculty recruitment and retention as part of this list. Which would make it very specific, much more specific than what it is now.

Gore

So you're going to do the process right Hillary? [inaudible] Okay, is there a second for the amendment?

Julia Mickenberg, assistant professor, American studies

Could we add students also? Student recruitment and retention in addition to faculty?

Gore

Are you okay with that? Because we can't entertain two at the same time?

Hart

Does it come after jeopardize? [inaudible] Honest evaluation?

Gore

Here I'll do it. Did we have a second? Melanie?

Hart

Recruitment of faculty.

Gore

And students.

Hart

Recruitment and retention. Recruitment and retention of faculty.

Gore

Can I make a comment while we are waiting, is I agree with you. I think it will impede recruitment and retention but I don't think that we have the statistics for that. And this is being given as an assertion. So I'm just concerned that we don't know that for a fact.

Pat-El

We also don't know that there will be a problem with honest evaluation, so we don't know any of this. This is our fear right. This is something that we want to say, that this is going to be a problem.

[inaudible]

Gore

Hillary, let me do it.

Hart

Yeah, you better do it.

Gore

Recruitment and retention of faculty and students comma. Oh, sorry. Let me undo.

Hart

So do you want to highlight the change, Andrea?

Gore

Sure, and was there, was I supposed to change?

Hart

Retention of faculty and students

Gore

And academic freedom goes before that, right? Because grammatically it works better. How's that?

Hart

Yeah, and recruitment and retention.

Gore

And where does jeopardize...

Hart

Oh and academic freedom comma recruitment and retention of faculty and students.

Gore

And jeopardize. With the "and" before jeopardize.

Hart

So if you highlight the change.

Gore

Sure. So this is what was added

Hart

So you're proposing this, the motion proposer? So we have a motion on the floor. Do we have a second? Okay, now we can have discussion. **[inaudible]** The discussion of the change, not the whole resolution. Discussion only of the amendment. Thank you, Patti.

Coleman Hutchinson, assistant professor, English

What about staff? I'm an English professor, I think recruitment and retention would cover the entire category if this motion were to go forward. I would recommend recruitment and retention and remove the categories. A little more elegant. It encompasses all including, staff, faculty and students.

Gore

I just crossed it out. Do we go back to the original amendment proposer?

Hart

First a second on the original one? Original proposer. Well no, we have to vote. We can't just keep wordsmithing.

Gore

Don't we go back to the proposer to let her accept?

Hart

She's accepted it. To just say recruitment and retention [inaudible] okay, leave it then, Andrea.

Gore

What do we do about Coleman's?

Hart

We have to vote up or down on this one and then we can if we want to vote on Coleman's?

Gore

So just uncross out. So this is what we are voting on now. The amendment specifically. Okay, so it's going to be a voice vote.

Hart

More discussion? Are we ready to vote? D you want to run the vote?

Gore

Yeah. All in favor, say aye [**all:** aye] Opposed say Nay. I like it better without but okay it passes. So this is added, so we're going to go back to the resolution now.

Hart

Right, is there more discussion on the complete resolution?

Gore

As it stands right now. I think we need a comma after inquiry. Tell me if that's right. [**inaudible**] No staff? [**inaudible**]

Ann Cvetkovich, professor, English

Hi, I'm a member of Faculty Council, professor of English and Women and Gender studies. Also very active with GunFreeUT on campus. Wanted to commend Faculty Council's EC and those on the committee for giving us this resolution. It may not say everything but I think it quite elegantly hits some key points and I think in terms of what Jody was saying earlier about statements that fit the identity of the particular bodies coming forward from Faculty Council, it is so important to assert the power of faculty governance around this issue. I think this is where, as Andrea was suggesting, a strong suggestion to the AAUP statement. I think we need to be prepared to use this body as we are doing so now. And also encourage all Faculty Council members to become even more active in addressing this issue in whatever way seems appropriate.

I think it's very important to see this issue as part of an attack on public education. It's a little bit of a skirmish that leaves us running, specifically around issues of guns. But it is not just about that. It is about sticking to restricted public space, I have to confess, although I understand the reason for it, I'm a little bit sad to see President Fenves suggest that as a state employee he can not challenge the law. As citizens, as members of this community, although it's kind of a catch 22, we need to recognize the importance of freedom and ability to determine the nature of our work places. So I think it is very important to align this with issues of academic freedom and the work that AAUP is doing to talk about the politics and the economics of education at this time. [45:37]

Gore

Thank you [**applause**] that was great.

Hart

There's a procedural issue. Michelle is right. We added "and staff" after the amendment was originally proposed and seconded. Who added staff? Was that Coleman? **[inaudible]** You have to vote. She can accept it but we have to vote on the amendment. Okay, so we have to vote on this one, okay? So one more time. I'm fully aware that we've added "and staff" after the original, it's my job to do this. So one more time

Gore

So are we voting on the word "staff"?

Hart

We are voting on the addition of "and staff".

Gore

Okay, do we have a motion and a second? Coleman, you moved it. Okay. All in favor of the word staff, say aye, say **[all: aye]** Opposed? Okay, staff is in.

Hart

So now we can go back to the resolution.

Gore

I clearly never read Robert's Rules of Order. Please.

James Galbraith, professor, LBJ School

I'm not a member of the Faculty Council, so I would like to request permission to speak. **[Gore: Yes.]** I came here today to express my very strong support for the spirit of this resolution and to associate myself with all of the comments that have just been made. This is a threat to the University, it is very important that the political leadership of the state understand the damage that they have done. And that they be made aware of the necessity for the future of the state that this damage be undone. Thank you. **[47:22]**

Gore

Thank you. Other comments on the resolution? **[Inaudible]** It's a very long sentence. Okay so we can deal with that later, okay. Well it sounds like we are ready to vote on this. So all in favor of the resolution as written, say aye **[all: aye]**, opposed? Abstentions? Alright. **[applause]** We are going to take a detour and invite Gerry Speitel up to do his degree program presentation; this will be very short and then we will vote on the last resolution which should also be short. Here you go. Oh, let me turn it into a presentation, there you go.

Okay, we have one more resolution and that is going to be presented by Jody Jensen. We do need to invite, because it's not from a committee right? I'm looking at you Hillary. But Jody is a member of the Executive Committee, okay.

Jensen

Okay, so, it was good luck timing or appropriate timing, that the AAUP issued this joint statement. We wanted to bring forward to Faculty Council for consideration that we would join in adopting this joint statement as well. It's relatively short so, I'll read you the three paragraphs here.

"The horrific shootings at Umpqua Community College in Oregon and subsequent incidents of gun violence elsewhere have prompted renewed efforts to keep our colleges and universities both safe and open. One measure increasingly proposed is legislation—already approved in eight states—that would allow any licensed gun owner to carry concealed weapons on campus. Advocates of such so-called "campus carry" legislation contend that the presence of weapons in classrooms and other campus facilities will deter those seeking to wreak violence. Oregon is one state where "campus carry" is legal, but that did not prevent the tragedy.

Colleges and universities closely control firearms and prohibit concealed guns on their campuses because they regard the presence of weapons as incompatible with their educational missions. College campuses are marketplaces of ideas, and a rigorous academic exchange of ideas may be chilled by the presence of weapons. Students and faculty members will not be comfortable discussing controversial subjects if they think there might be a gun in the room.

William McRaven, chancellor for the University of Texas system and a former member of the Navy SEALs who rose to the rank of admiral, opposed passage of “campus carry” legislation in his state. “I feel the presence of concealed weapons will make a campus a less-safe environment,” he said. “If you have guns on campus, I question whether or not that will somehow inhibit our freedom of speech. If you’re in a heated debate with somebody in the middle of a classroom and you don’t know whether or not that individual is carrying, how does that inhibit the interaction between students and faculty?”

The undersigned organizations strongly support efforts to make college campuses as safe and weapon-free as possible for students, faculty, staff, parents, and community members. We therefore oppose efforts to enact “campus carry” laws and call for their repeal where they already exist. We encourage colleges and universities to embrace critical incident planning that includes faculty and staff and to advise all faculty and staff of these plans. We further call on these institutions to rely on trained and equipped professional law-enforcement personnel to respond to emergency incidents. State legislative bodies must refrain from interfering with decisions that are properly the responsibility of the academic community.

The signatories include: American Association of University Professors, American Federation of Teachers, the Association of American Colleges and Universities and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. With this I submit this statement and ask that The University of Texas approve and adopt.

Gore

So it sounds like you’re making a motion? Is there a second? Okay. Discussion? [55:51]

Snodderly

About a year ago, I got a letter from the president of the AAUP pointing out that The University of Texas at Austin was home to one of the Association’s original chapters. I’m writing to you today to offer you the AAUP’s assistance in revising a chapter on your campus during our centennial year. It seems to me, appropriate in endorsing the resolution that the AAUP has negotiated through these prestigious bodies to ask if we can consider reviving our chapter in this august organization.

Gore

I think we should vote on the resolution first and then we can talk about that. Any comments on the resolution?

Mickenberg

I strongly support the resolution; I’m just curious if other universities are also voting and signing the resolution as well? Since it only lists these larger bodies.

Jensen

I don’t know the explicit answer to that. I can tell you that because members of this Faculty Council Executive Committee serve on the Texas Council for Faculty Senates and another group, a name of which I can’t remember (**Gore:** UT System, the advisory.) -- UT System, Faculty Advisory Council -- we’ll be sharing this as action we’ve taken. Whether it’s at the president level or at Faculty Senate level, there is communication within the state. So we’ll share our actions.

Beckner

I would just remark that this resolution came out on the 12th which was Thursday, so I think it was fortuitous for us to have a meeting today so that we could immediately bring it up. And other groups involved on this effort on campus have posted this message too.

Gore

Other comments? Questions? Okay, let’s vote. All in favor [**all:** aye] Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. I think that’s it. Yes, Alan?

Alan Friedman, professor, English

Since the question was raised about an AAUP presence on this campus, I thought perhaps I should say something. As a former member of the National Council of the AAUP, former chair of the National Committee on Governance, and former president of the UT Chapter of AAUP for many years there was only so much that I

and a very small number of other faculty could do to sustain an AAUP presence on this campus when there was, it seemed, almost no interest on the part of the administration or the faculty. If indeed there is now new interest, maybe in the light of the AAUP's support for what's going on in this campus, faculty might want to think about reviving the chapter. I think it would be an excellent idea. [59:29]

Beckner

I would just like to comment that I don't know about chapters but our former colleague on the Council and the Council's Executive Committee, Brian Evans, who is a member of the faculty in the Cockrell School of Engineering, has been very active. Certainly the last, I don't know, 6 to 10 years, he has been promoting faculty engagement with the AAUP.

Gore

So I don't know what to tell you Max. I think that if this is something you want to do, I don't think it has to necessarily go through the Faculty Council. [inaudible] Yeah, if you're willing to be a point person for people who are interested, that might be a good way to get it started.

[Inaudible]

Snodderly

...Pat Somers, who is a member of one of the executive boards of the Texas AAUP, is preparing paperwork to reinstitute the chapter at UT. If people can contact me or her, we'd like to enroll enough people. And I might just say there's an important legal reason to do this. When the question was raised about challenging the law, the question is who has standing to do it. And actually the Faculty Council has some pretty good standing, but GunFree UT as an ad-hoc organization does not. However, if we have a chapter of the AAUP, this is a nationally recognized organization and it has a kind of standing that individual members of the faculty don't have. So I think we should think about that as a place for us, another home.

Gore

Thank you. Anything else? Okay, so just a couple announcements, reminders. Protests for the Liberal Arts Undergraduate catalog on Wednesday, and our next meeting is December 7th. So thank you all. This was a really important meeting. I think it was a unique opportunity for us to pass 3 resolutions for which the timing and juxtaposition are really kind of historical in my opinion. So thank you again for all, for being here.

[1:02:11]

Meeting end at 3:18 pm.

[Appendix B](#)



BS Degree Program in Computational Engineering

Rationale

- Designed to combine fundamental engineering principles with advanced knowledge of mathematics, computational methods and programming techniques
- Puts Cockrell School at forefront of engineering education as engineering design becomes more computationally intensive
- Meets student demand for more instruction in computational engineering
- Will expand job opportunities for students in meeting growing industry demand for engineers with computational backgrounds
- Will complement current graduate program in Computational Science Engineering and Mathematics

Implementation and Impact

- No net change in undergraduate enrollment (i.e., fewer Aerospace Engineering Students)
- No effect on the department or school budget
- No net effect on most CNS courses taken by engineering students
- Because of differences in ASE and CompE degree plans, small increase in CNS enrollment (~30 students per year) in SDS 322, SDS 329C, and M 362K
- Approvals for impacted CNS courses have been obtained

Summary

- Aerospace Engineering faculty overwhelmingly supported the creation of an undergraduate degree in computational engineering
- CSE Degrees and Courses Committee unanimously supported the proposal
- CSE faculty unanimously supported the proposal
- Goal is inclusion in 2016-18 Undergraduate Catalog with a full launch of the program in Fall 2017

Questions?

First Year

| FALL | Hours | SPRING | Hours |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|
| UGS 302 or 303 | 3 | COE 301 | 3 |
| CH 301 | 3 | M 40BD | 4 |
| M 40BC | 4 | PHY 303K | 3 |
| RHE 306 | 3 | PHY 103M | 1 |
| Social and behavioral science | 3 | American and Texas Government | 3 |
| | | American History | 3 |
| | 16 | | 17 |

Second Year

| FALL | Hours | SPRING | Hours |
|----------|-------|----------|-------|
| E M 306 | 3 | COE 211K | 2 |
| M E 320 | 3 | COE 111L | 1 |
| M 427J | 4 | M 427L | 4 |
| PHY 303L | 3 | E M 311M | 3 |
| PHY 103N | 1 | E M 319 | 3 |
| M E 210 | 2 | ASE 333T | 3 |
| | 16 | | 16 |

Third Year

| FALL | Hours | SPRING | Hours |
|--------------------|-------|----------------------------|-------|
| ASE 320 | 3 | ASE 347 | 3 |
| M 362K | 3 | ASE 321K | 3 |
| ASE 330M | 3 | SDS 322 | 3 |
| SDS 329C or M 340L | 3 | American Government | 3 |
| E 316L/M/N/P | 3 | Visual and performing arts | 3 |
| | 15 | | 15 |

Fourth Year

| FALL | Hours | SPRING | Hours |
|---|-------|--------------------|-------|
| COE 373 | 3 | COE 374 | 3 |
| COE 371 | 3 | COE 372 | 3 |
| COE 352 | 3 | Technical Elective | 3 |
| ASE 375 | 3 | American History | 3 |
| Technical Elective | 3 | | |
| | 15 | | 12 |
| Electives will be a mix of existing and new courses | | | |