

## DOCUMENTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES  
OF THE GENERAL FACULTY FOR 2015-2016

The annual reports of the standing committees of the General Faculty for 2015-16 received to date are reproduced below.



Hillary Hart, Secretary  
General Faculty and Faculty Council

**A. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEES****A-1 Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility**Committee Members:

Professor Rajashri Srinivasan, committee chair, Daniel A. Bonevac, Brian Evans, Alan W. Friedman, Jody Jensen, Desmond F. Lawler, Linda E. Reichl, David S. Sokolow, James C. Spindler, and Hannah Wojciehowski

Faculty members are engaged in fostering critical thinking and in developing and disseminating new knowledge. Having academic freedom in teaching, research, and expression enables a faculty member to critique accepted truths and search for new knowledge, even when it disrupts the status quo. Academic freedom safeguards of tenure, due process, and faculty governance allow faculty members to serve the common good without being controlled by public opinion.

The Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR) advises the president and provost on procedures for due process for faculty members, including procedures in tenure, promotion, faculty annual evaluation, and comprehensive post-tenure review cases, as well as safeguards for academic freedom, including those in teaching, research, and expression.

CCAFR also investigates claims by faculty members who allege violations of due process or academic freedom principles, especially in their tenure, promotion, faculty annual evaluation, or comprehensive post-tenure review cases. Please refer to Appendix A. For a short summary of academic freedom principles, see Appendix B. Claims of academic freedom violations are not limited to tenure, promotion, faculty annual evaluations, or post-tenure review cases.

In 2015-16, the work of CCAFR can be divided into three separate subjects, and each subject is described in a separate section in this document:

1. Investigations of claims of procedural irregularities in tenure and promotion cases,
2. Development of guidelines University mid-probationary period review and mentoring faculty
3. Other open issues to protect academic freedom and strengthen its safeguards.

**1. Subcommittee Reports on Claims of Procedural Violations in Tenure/Promotion Cases**

Assistant professors who receive a decision of terminal appointment pending (i.e., tenure denial pending further review) have four internal avenues of appeal. The first two avenues occur in parallel in February-April: Final Arguments based on the substance of the case and CCAFR appeal based on procedures used in the case. The third avenue, reconsideration by the Budget Council or Executive Committee, would start with the next promotion cycle in April/May. The fourth avenue is Faculty Grievance, which would primarily be based on claims of violations of the faculty member's employment and civil rights in State and/or Federal Law. Tenured faculty members only have access to CCAFR appeal and Faculty Grievance.

In January 2016, one lecturer faculty with a joint appointment in two colleges who filed a CCAFR appeal, in which he/she claimed procedural violations concerning his/her promotion case. The faculty also alleged a violation of academic freedom.

Based on our investigation and consideration of the facts of this case, we concluded that there were deviations from the University guidelines and a violation of this faculty's academic freedom in teaching. In this regard, we note that this is the first time that CCAFR has received a CCAFR from a lecturer.

Although we believe that the procedural errors and academic freedom violation contributed to the denial of promotion, we do not believe that the promotion decision would have been different if they had not occurred. The CCAFR subcommittee also recommended that the department avoid similar conflicts in the future.

The CCAFR subcommittee's submitted a report noting the procedural violations and violation of academic freedom, but President Fenves disagreed with CCAFR's conclusions.

With 1800 tenured/tenure-track faculty and 1300 non-tenure-track teaching faculty at UT Austin in 2014-15 according to the UT Austin Statistical Handbook, CCAFR recommended strengthening institutional support, faculty governance and due process for non-tenure-track teaching faculty.

### **2. 1 University Guidelines for Mid-Probationary Period Review**

Each department and each non-departmentalized college/school conducts a review for each assistant professor for his/her third year of tenure probationary clock. This is called a mid-probationary period review. It is essentially the faculty annual review that evaluates the faculty candidate's trajectory toward tenure and promotion based on the faculty member's performance while in rank. It is worth noting that several departments at UT Austin actually evaluate a faculty member's record over two or three years during the annual review. This is particularly useful in a book-oriented field where one might publish a book once every three years.

When the faculty annual review process was overhauled by CCAFR, Faculty Council, Faculty Council Executive Committee, and the University administration for fall 2013, due to changes in *Regents Rule* 31102, the new University faculty annual review guidelines did not explicitly mention the mid-probationary review. While CCAFR is already embedded in annual and comprehensive periodic reviews as well as tenure and promotion cases, it is not involved in the process for mid-probationary period review to ensure the academic freedom safeguards of due process and faculty governance.

Based on this, following guidance from the provost's office in fall 2015, CCAFR also worked on the development of clear and common guidelines for the various departments to prepare a mid-probationary period review for assistant professors. A draft document was prepared, discussed in the Faculty Council Executive Committee and then in a joint meeting with CCAFR and Dr. Janet Dukerich, senior vice provost for faculty affairs, and the provost's office director, Carmen Shockley.

There was consensus for the need for such a University-wide document, but it was agreed that as there were college-specific guidelines in place, this review document would be revised to ensure streamlining with the college-specific guidelines and provided to the provost office for further consideration and dissemination at the University-level. This is under preparation by CCAFR.

### **2.2 University Guidelines for Mentoring Professors**

Effective mentoring of assistant professors and associate professors remains a difficult, systemic challenge at all levels of the University organization. To address this issue, a CCAFR subcommittee was formed to develop guidelines for mentoring assistant and associate professors, which are clear and consistent across various schools and departments. This document is expected to ready in fall 2016.

### **3. Other Open Issues to Protect Academic Freedom and Strengthen its Safeguards**

CCAFR is concerned with two open issues affecting academic freedom in research, teaching and expression, as well as its safeguards of tenure, due process, and faculty governance, including but not limited to the following.

- *College Promotion and Tenure Committees*  
There may be a lack of transparency of promotion processes at the college/school level, including how college tenure and promotion committee members are chosen, how members of the same

department on the college Tenure and Promotion Committee (T&P) give input on a case, and how the dean is involved in college/school T&P meetings and other processes. We would recommend that each college/school make this information available to its faculty each year.

We acknowledge that Dr. Janet Dukerich has made a very strong effort to personally communicate the guidelines to assistant professors and the deans/heads of departments in various schools. We commend this effort and request that these efforts move to cover the Executive Committees/Budget Councils at the various departments/schools so all the individuals involved in the T&P meetings are aware of all the procedures, with a view to reduce procedural violations in the T&P process to zero.

- *Evaluating Scholarship*

On evaluating scholarship in faculty evaluations, we are aware of two persistent needs in some departments and colleges/schools:

- a. There is a need for full disclosure by departments and colleges regarding criteria for evaluation and relative weighting of types of scholarship, including peer-reviewed books, book reviews, book chapters, and articles, as well as performance/exhibition venues for audio/visual works.
- b. There is the problem of the “double bind”, or “Catch-22”, which can happen when a candidate is recruited and hired to conduct research in a relatively new field, encouraged to publish results in peer reviewed journals specialized for the new field, but then told that since their specialized journals are not top-tier, they are denied tenure and promotion.

---

#### **Appendix A: Guidelines for Filing a Claim with CCAFR**

<https://wikis.utexas.edu/download/attachments/141736506/D%2013051-13082b?api=v2>

The Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR) is one avenue of appeal in tenure and promotion cases, faculty annual reviews and comprehensive post-tenure reviews. In tenure and promotion cases, the other three avenues of appeal are final arguments, faculty grievance, and departmental reconsideration. All avenues of appeal may be pursued. In comprehensive post-tenure review cases, the other two avenues of appeal are a second review by the college and faculty grievance. All avenues of appeal may be pursued.

CCAFR investigates claims of violations of procedures and/or academic freedom principles. University procedures are described in the above references for comprehensive post-tenure review [1], faculty annual reviews [4] and tenure and promotion [5]. Academic freedom principles include those adopted by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The 1940 AAUP tenets of academic freedom are given in Appendix B. CCAFR does not review disputes about professional judgments concerning the merits of the faculty member’s record.

Once a CCAFR appeal has been submitted to the Office of the General Faculty, the CCAFR chair will appoint a subcommittee of three CCAFR members to investigate the claim. The CCAFR members of the subcommittee, when possible, will not be from the same college or school as the claimant’s primary appointment. It will help the CCAFR subcommittee investigating the appeal if the claims in the appeal are enumerated so that the subcommittee can refer to the number of each claim in their report.

For a comprehensive post-tenure review, the faculty member could appeal to CCAFR as soon as the initial review was made available, which is scheduled to take place by February 1. Alternately, a faculty member could appeal the review outcome to the college, wait for the college to report the results of the second review by June 1, and then appeal to CCAFR.

For tenure and promotion cases, the deadline to submit a CCAFR appeal is the later of January 31 or six weeks after the faculty was officially notified of denial of tenure or promotion. From the fall 2012 version of the *General Guidelines* for tenure and promotion, we highlight some of the rights of a promotion candidate. Any denial of these rights, or any unreasonable delay in the exercise of these rights, may constitute a procedural violation. Procedural violations may or may not rise to the level of tainting a promotion case.

- a. What academic years count toward the tenure probationary period? (section A.3b)  
*Only academic years in which the faculty member was appointed at 100% time in fall and 100% in spring at UT Austin are counted toward the tenure probationary period. The tenure probationary period is six years, and assistant professors would apply for tenure and promotion immediately after five years of the tenure probationary period. Any application prior to that would be considered early and would have to be justified.*
- b. Evaluation of assistant professors who had the probationary period extended (section A.3b).  
*The tenure probationary period may be extended. For example, a faculty member may extend the tenure probationary period by one year for each childbirth or adoption, up to a maximum of two years of extension. When the assistant professor is evaluated by the University or by external reviewers, the review should treat all of the faculty member's work as being completed in the typical five-year period.*
- c. Review of associate professors without tenure (section A.3b).  
*They must apply for tenure immediately after two years in rank.*
- d. Review of associate professors with tenure for early promotion (section A.4).  
*The usual case is to apply for promotion to professor immediately after five years in rank. Any application submitted earlier than that would have to be justified. See next item.*
- e. Review of associate professors with tenure in rank for ten plus years (section A.4).  
*Associate professors with tenure have a right to be evaluated for promotion by their department after completing ten years in rank, and if denied, every five years thereafter.*
- f. Review by candidate of promotion materials before the department considers the case, with opportunity for candidate to seek redress of incomplete/inaccurate materials (section B.1b).  
*The department chair must request that the promotion candidate review the entire promotion package before the package is considered by the department. This allows time for the promotion candidate to bring any issues in the promotion package to the attention of the department chair before the department considers the case. See also item (g) next.*
- g. Review of promotion materials by candidate at any time (section B.3).  
*At any time during the promotion process in the department, college or upper administration, a promotion candidate may informally request to see or may formally request to have copies of any or all parts of the promotion package. This is to ensure transparency in the process.*
- h. Creation of a new "Additional Statements" section to allow the promotion candidate to provide statements related to the promotion process being applied in their case (section C.9).  
*This new section in the promotion package allows space for the promotion candidate to raise and respond to any issues of concern in the promotion package.*

The Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) section 3.17 says the following:

- "Responsibility for submitting Annual Reports and for keeping their personnel files up-to-date with any new material concerning teaching activities, research, scholarship, publications or public service rests with the individual faculty members. The annual evaluation of each faculty member shall include an assessment of these documents.... The final results of the annual evaluation shall be communicated to each faculty member by the department chair. This communication shall be written and it shall advise the faculty member of any areas that need improvement."  
*Comment: The annual evaluation in writing helps a faculty member know what needs improvement in teaching, research and/or service. This is particularly helpful during the tenure probationary process. In addition, having written annual evaluations is helpful when there is a change in Department Chairs during a faculty member's promotion period. HOP 3.17as quoted above predates the new guidelines for faculty annual review:  
<https://utexas.app.box.com/s/drdz0rnh9mqx2d7c7g8uat8i3zns0ue2>*

---

**Appendix B: 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure by AAUP**  
<https://wikis.utexas.edu/download/attachments/141736506/D%2013051-13082b?api=v2>

Tenets of academic freedom from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) from its *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* are

1. “Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.”
2. “Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitation on academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.”
3. “College and University teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak and write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institutions by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.”

*Note: “The word ‘teacher’ as used in this document is understood to [also] include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties.” The word ‘teacher’ as used above also includes adjunct faculty, research faculty and lecturers.*

More information is available at <http://www.aaup.org>.

Rajashri Srinivasan, chair

#### **A-2 Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets**

Membership: Elizabeth Cullingford, Janet Davis, Ofodike Ezejoye, Elizabeth Gerschoff, Andrea Gore, Michelle Habeck, Hillary Hart, Jody Jensen, Jonathan Kaplan, Susan Klein, D. Paul Newman, Domino Perez, and Maggie Rivas-Rodriguez

The UT Austin operating budget faces challenges on many fronts, including inflationary pressures, declining state general revenue, and flat undergraduate resident tuition:

<b>UT Austin Budget Sources</b>	<b>2012-13 [1]</b>	<b>2013-14 [2]</b>	<b>2014-15 [3]</b>	<b>2015-16 [4]</b>
Tuition and Fees	25%	24%	22%	21%
State General Revenue	13%	13%	12%	13%
Annual University Fund	8%	9%	10%	9%
Gifts and Endowments	9%	10%	10%	9%
Research Grants & Other	45%	44%	46%	48%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2.35B</b>	<b>\$2.48B</b>	<b>\$2.66B</b>	<b>\$2.81B</b>

The State Legislature decides the annual general revenue every other year. The State General Revenue has been increasing slightly each year in absolute amounts, but has generally been declining in percentage of the operating budget [1-4] with 2015-16 being an exception [5]. For example, State general revenue in 1984-85 accounted for 47% of the \$503M operating budget [1].

The Annual University Fund (AUF) includes income from the Permanent University Fund, which receives revenue from oil- and mineral-producing land. AUF is split 2/3 for The UT System and 1/3 for the Texas A&M University System. UT Austin receives about 30% [4]. For 2015-16 budget sources, UT Austin received \$231M recurring revenue plus \$25M for the Medical School (same as in 2014-15 [5]) and \$12M in other non-recurring revenue [4]. In 2015-16, AUF accounted for 9.5% of revenue, which was rounded to 9% [4].

In 2015-16, UT Austin earned \$558M in research contracts and grants, \$167M in other external revenue directly for an academic purpose, and \$428M in self-supporting revenue (which included \$150M from athletics and \$88M from housing/food). [4]

The recurring cost for the new Medical School increased from \$26.5M in 2014-15 to \$66.8M in 2015-16 [9]. The Medical School is expecting its first class in fall 2016.

The two largest expenditures in the 2015-16 operating budget are salaries and benefits (\$1.468B; 52%) and maintenance and operation (\$560M; 20%) [4]. The academic core expenditures (\$1.417B) included \$840M in salaries and benefits. Within salaries and benefits, faculty salaries (\$290M) cost about the same as staff salaries (\$287M) [4]. In fall 2015, excluding faculty members whose primary duties are administrative (deans, directors, administrative officials, etc.), UT Austin had 3,090 teaching faculty [7] of which 61.5% are tenured/tenure-track faculty [7], and more than 16,000 dedicated staff [8].

Significant annual losses in the academic core budget were projected from 2015-16 to 2018-19, based on 2014-15 figures [5]. The projected losses were \$20.9M, \$20.4M, \$49.9M and \$41.1M, respectively. In 2015, President Fenves asked the Tuition Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) to recommend “the amount of tuition needed to fund the university's forecasted core academic budget” [10]. TPAC, which included faculty and students, held public forums and solicited online feedback. On December 3, 2015, TPAC recommended “a tuition increase of 3.00% in each year for 2016-17 and 2017-18 for Texas resident undergraduate students, non-resident undergraduate students, and all graduate and professional school students” in a memo to the President. The memo further states “State general revenue was reduced by \$46 million annually (\$92 million for the biennium) in 2012-2013 and has not yet recovered to 2009 levels. Resident undergraduate tuition rate has not increased since the fall of 2011.” The report points out that six public universities in Texas charged higher undergraduate resident tuition than UT Austin. The UT System adopted the increase. The increase in net revenue from tuition will be about \$15M/year.

On April 25, 2016, our committee met with the UT Austin CFO, Darrell Bazzell, who had joined UT Austin a week earlier, and the Associate VP of Finance, Mary Knight. Mr. Bazzell emphasized process improvement. Faculty pointed out that costs associated with faculty time are sometimes not included in cost-benefit analysis for a decision and that it would be a win-win to streamline paperwork, e.g. for acquisition, accounting and faculty activity reports\*. Mr. Bazzell agreed and mentioned that at his previous position at the University of Wisconsin, they were able to streamline the bureaucracy. For example, they reduced access to new external funding from 119 days to 19 days. Perhaps most important is that Darrell Bazzell emphasized that a university is not a business. The faculty members wholeheartedly agreed. The university provides an experience in learning and personal development in the classroom and extra-curricular activities, for undergraduate and graduate students. The committee offers its availability to give advice and feedback.

*\* Over the summer of 2015, Prof. Janet Dukerich (Senior Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs) removed the requirement of filing the faculty annual report with the Provost's Office; however, many departments, schools and colleges may still require faculty to file one.*

At the April 25<sup>th</sup> meeting, we expressed our concern to Mr. Bazzell about Shared Services. Shared Services ran pilot programs in the College of Education, College of Liberal Arts and in the Central Administration. The intent was to gain efficiency and increase career path opportunities within UT Austin. No outsourcing was planned. In fall 2014, College of Education scaled back its participation and allowed each academic unit in the college to decide on their own to participate or not. Faculty expressed concern that Shared Services was a top-down hierarchical business model in which faculty were viewed as staff.

At a meeting of the FACB on March 28, 2016, Mary Knight (Interim CFO and Associate VP for Research) mentioned that Shared Services had not yet yielded any overall cost savings. The two Shared Services programs were in the Central Business Office and Academic Technology Support [11]. ATS has IT staff in each college. The administration is waiting for the new CFO to decide on how to proceed with Shared Services.

On August 18, 2016, CFO Darrell Bazzell sent e-mail to all UT Austin employees entitled “Update on Central Business Office (CBO) Pilot Program”. He writes:

*This included a review of the Shared Services pilot program, which is intended to provide centralized*

*support services to individual colleges, schools and units through the Academic Technology Support (ATS) and the Central Business Office (CBO) units. I have determined that the CBO pilot program has not produced the savings and efficiencies initially anticipated when it was launched in 2014.*

*For this reason, it is necessary to phase out the CBO in its current structure.*

Shared Services is part of Transforming UT, which was launched in spring 2013 to increase productivity in university business operations. The others are administrative systems modernization, asset utilization and technology commercialization.

On November 20, 2015, we met with Renee Wallace who heads the administrative systems modernization program “to modernize the University’s administrative systems, business processes, data management, and technical architecture.” [13] In place of the university mainframe, ASMP 2.0 has adopted cloud-based, distributed, mobile-friendly frameworks for back office functions, including Workday for HR/Payroll and Finance. Faculty suggested to streamline back office functions and improve faculty productivity, including travel, reimbursement, purchasing, and effort certification. We suggested drawing inspiration from the federal Paperwork Reduction Act (1980) to reduce the amount of information needed and let faculty take responsibility. On a request for travel authorization, let the faculty member say that he/she will properly cover any courses he/she is teaching (as a checkbox) without having to give detailed information about how.

The above meeting was a follow-up to a meeting with Ms. Wallace on November 24, 2014. At that meeting, we made the following suggestions:

- Create an electronic idea box for university apps and software
- Create focus groups on purchasing with faculty from large research centers and from music/fine arts because of their unusual requests
- Simplify initiating purchases and reconciling purchases after the fact

The 2014-15 Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets also raised the following issues:

- The online conflict of interest forms are also difficult to use and understand
- Tenured/tenure-track positions to be reduced in College of Liberal Arts via attrition %
- Cluster hiring of senior faculty allocated to five of the 18 colleges/schools &
- Destination of funds raised during the \$3B Capital Campaign [2]

*% The College of Liberal Arts has 492 of the 1805 tenured/tenure-track teaching faculty at UT Austin in 2014-15 [14]. Up to 80 tenured/tenure-track positions will be discontinued.*

*& Concerns include how the five colleges/schools were chosen, and what will happen to the ability to hire at the Assistant Professor level in those colleges/schools.*

The 2013-14 Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets also raised the issues below [12]:

- Distribution of 2% contingency fund held by each department
- Relative weighting of research, teaching and service in annual faculty evaluations
- Work with Legislature to fulfill its financial commitment to excellence in higher ed
- Integration of Medical School students, faculty, staff and processes with campus
- Concern about applying a uniform standard for merit raises across departments
- Request for university-wide policy on the percentage of faculty to receive merit raises

UT Austin has many tough choices ahead to balance budgets in the face of anticipated deficits while fulfilling its increasing commitments to undergraduate, professional and graduate education. Especially during this time of austerity, many non-administrative faculty members would like to have greater input in administrative decisions on budgetary matters in departments, colleges and upper administration.

## References

- [1] *Changing the World*, p. 7, Nov.-Dec., 2012, <http://issuu.com/utaustin/docs/changing-the-world-nov-dec-2012/7>
- [2] “The Campaign for Texas”, bottom of Web page at <http://news.utexas.edu/2014/09/02/campaign-for-texas-goes-out-with-a-bang>
- [3] “Funding Then and Now”, <https://giving.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Bevo-Chart-2014-15.pdf>
- [4] “A Primer on The University Budget Fiscal Year 2015-16”, <https://utexas.app.box.com/v/1516-budget-summary>
- [5] Dan Slesnick, “A Primer on The University Budget Fiscal Year 2014-15”, <http://www.utexas.edu/provost/planning/naaw/pdf/17-University%20Budget.pdf>
- [6] “Facts & Figures”, <http://www.utexas.edu/about/facts-and-figures>
- [7] “Faculty Characteristics”, *Statistical Handbook*, UT Austin, Fall 2015, [https://sps.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/IRRIS/StatHandbook/IMA\\_FS\\_TFacRankGen\\_2015\\_AY.pdf](https://sps.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/IRRIS/StatHandbook/IMA_FS_TFacRankGen_2015_AY.pdf)
- [8] <http://staffcouncil.utexas.edu/>
- [9] “Budgeted Expenditures by Dean/Vice president Units and Departments”, *Statistical Handbook*, UT Austin, Fall 2015, [https://sps.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/IRRIS/StatHandbook/IMA\\_F\\_BudgetExpDeanVP\\_2015\\_FY.pdf](https://sps.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/IRRIS/StatHandbook/IMA_F_BudgetExpDeanVP_2015_FY.pdf)
- [10] “Tuition Policy Advisory Committee”, <http://tuition.utexas.edu/learn-more/tpac>
- [11] “Academic Technology Support”, <https://ats.utexas.edu>
- [12] “**2013-2014 Annual Report A-2 Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets**”, <http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2013-2014/reports/standcom/a2.html>
- [13] <https://www.utexas.edu/asmp/about>
- [14] <https://www.utexas.edu/transforming-ut/shared-services/messages/december-2014-shared-services-update>
- [15] “Full-Time Equivalent Faculty By College and Tenure Status”, *Statistical Handbook*, UT Austin, Fall 2014, [https://sp.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/rpt/Documents/IMA\\_FS\\_FTEFacColTen\\_2014\\_AY.pdf](https://sp.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/rpt/Documents/IMA_FS_FTEFacColTen_2014_AY.pdf)

Brian L. Evans, chair

### A-3 Faculty Committee on Committees

1. At the initial meeting on September 14, 2015, Gayle Acton was selected as chair elect for 2016-17.
2. On April 12, 2016, the committee reviewed nominations by the general faculty for standing committee membership with attention to representation from all colleges and schools and to issues of gender and racial diversity, as well as University regulations and operating procedures. Identified faculty members were recommended to the president to serve on eighteen standing committees.

The committee wishes to thank Ms. Debbie Roberts and Ms. Victoria Cervantes for their help.

Madeline Sutherland-Meier, chair

### A-4 Faculty Grievance Committee

There was one formal grievance filed with the Faculty Grievance Committee during the academic year 2015-16.

The Faculty Grievance Committee chair did receive a number of emails from faculty members



inquiring about grievance policies and procedures. On two occasions, the chair was contacted to meet directly with faculty members and discuss the grievance process with them and answer questions regarding grievance policies and procedures. No further inquiry or contact was made to the chair by either of these two faculty members.

Seema Agarwala (professor, molecular biosciences) was elected chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee for academic year 2016-17.

Snehal Shingavi, chair

#### **A-5 Faculty Welfare Committee**

In fall 2015, the committee met to set an agenda for our work in the 2015-16 school year. In that meeting the committee discussed priority issues that were impacting UT Austin faculty. Among the issues that were discussed were the presence of guns on campus (a safety issue for faculty), minority recruitment and gender equity. After lengthy discussion of current initiatives on campus, the committee decided to spend the year focusing on gender equity, specifically recruiting and hiring practices among the various units. Although other issues such as retention and promotion are also very important, we wanted to begin at the beginning in our initial efforts – we wanted to focus on the pool of candidates from which hires are drawn. We also elected Amanda Hager as chair elect at that initial meeting.

At the start of the year, the committee consisted of:

Brockett, Patrick L., professor, information, risk, and operations management

Hager, Amanda, lecturer, mathematics (chair elect)

Kahlor, Lee Ann, associate professor, advertising (chair)

Leite, Fernanda L., assistant professor, civil, architectural, & environmental engineering

Moser, Scott James, assistant professor, government

Peroni, Robert J., professor, law

Schwitters, Roy F., professor, physics

Echols, Catherine H., associate professor, psychology

Loving, Timothy J., associate professor, human development and family sciences

In the subsequent weeks, the committee corresponded with College of Communication units and dean (as this is the home college of the chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee) to find out if anyone was aware of data having been collected in the last few years specific to female faculty recruitment and hiring by any entities on campus. The response was no for that college. We then reached out to the associate vice president for inclusion and equity and learned of recruitment best practices, but no data for the University on actual recruitment by gender. Finally, we consulted the reports from various bodies on campus that have looked at the issue of gender equity, and again found no recent data on actual recruitment by gender. At this point we decided as a committee to collect our own data to serve as a baseline for any efforts moving forward.

On October 8, 2015, the chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, Lee Ann Kahlor, sent an email to all teaching units at the University of Texas at Austin to solicit data about the recruitment and hiring of female faculty within each unit. The recipient list is included in Appendix A and data requested is listed in Appendix B. The mailing list was compiled by one of Kahlor's graduate research assistants who spent time on the University Website to seek out emails for department and teaching unit heads. The recipients of the email were asked to forward it to whoever would be best qualified to provide the data – our attempt at snowball sampling as we knew the original list was imperfect. Some forwarded it to a member of the department who was overseeing equity issues within the unit, others forwarded the requests to their dean's offices, and some had no idea whether such information was collected and, if it was, who had possession of it (this latter scenario was the most common).

It became clear early on that if gender equity in recruitment and hiring is something the University is committed to improving, that there needs to be simple data collection implemented within each college or unit to ensure that improvements (or lack of improvements) over the coming years can be

documented and learned from. This kind of data can serve as self-reflection for colleges and units, and can alert the University to areas of campus that can benefit from increased support in their efforts to recruit female faculty.

Despite the best of intentions, however, members of the Faculty Council and the University Gender Equity Council asked the Faculty Welfare Committee in mid-October to cease data collection out of fear that the effort was duplicating other efforts underway at the University and may prove to be a burden to the teaching units. Although we had not heard of duplication of effort from the units we contacted, we decided to rescind the request for data on October 16, 2015. We had, by that time however, already heard from fifteen units.

The rest of the year was spent compiling the data that is included in this annual report.

This report shares the responses and data collected from those responding departments, schools, and colleges. There are two tables, responses to open-ended data, and appendices to detail our data collection methods.

Note: This data is incomplete (collection was ceased prematurely and we likely experienced response bias having only heard from the most eager respondents before collection ceased). As such, the data should only serve to supplement any other data that has been collected at this point. That said, there is tremendously useful information contained within this report.

Table 1: Open positions during years reported

Unit	Years reported	Open-positions NTT	Open-positions Assi	Open-positions Asso	Open-positions Full
American Studies	>3	0	1	0	0
Art and Art History	na	73	5	1	1
Asian Studies	5	10	1	1	1
Cockrell School of Engineering	5	5	66	9	29
Communication Sciences and Disorders	1	1	1	0	0
Communication Studies Department	14	0	0	1-2	2
Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Department of Educational Administration	>3	2	3	0	0
Health Outcomes and Pharmacy Practice Division, UT College of Pharmacy	3.5	4	1	0	0
Integrative Biology	>3	0	1	0	0
Information, Risk, & Operations Management McCombs School	3	2	5	0	0
LBJ School of Public Affairs	5<	0	14	2	0

Pharmacotherapy Division, College of Pharmacy	>3	1	1	0	0
Philosophy	5	1	3	2	1
Special Education	2	0	4	0	1

Table 1 reports timeframe for data reported (years reported) and positions that were open during that time (NNT = non-tenure track, Assi = assistant professor, Asso = associate professor, Full = full professor).

Table 2: Applicants, interviews, offers and hires by gender for years reported in Table 1

Unit	Female applicants	Male applicants	Female campus interviews	Male campus interviews	Offers female	Offers males	Females hired	Males hired
American Studies	356	358	1	3	1	0	1	0
Art and Art History	325	304	72	67	36	39	36	39
Asian Studies	91	44	17	10	9	6	7	6
Cockrell School of Engineering	1,067	5,773	80	197	29	61	22	53
Communication Sciences and Disorders	15	12	6	0	3	0	2	15
Communication Studies Department	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Department of Educational Administration	152	95	12	8	4	1	4	1
Health Outcomes and Pharmacy Practice Division, Pharm	13	6	10	4	4	1	4	1

(NNT = non-tenure track, Assi = assistant professor, Asso = associate professor, Full = full professor)

### Responses to open-ended questions

The following text provides responses to open-ended questions. These are reported by unit and cover initiatives, events, barriers, and awareness of-use of University resources.

#### American Studies

One of the preferred qualifications for the assistant professor position was a background in Women's and Gender Studies. We posted the assistant professor position on H-Net Job Guide and placed the job ad under the category of Women, Gender and Sexuality so that it would reach as many women as possible.

We cosponsor Center for Women's and Gender Studies events throughout the year and we collaborate on lectures with them as well. We also collaborate with the Center for Women's and Gender Studies mentor program for new female faculty hires by ensuring the new faculty member is aware of the program and has met their mentor. Our two most recent female hires participated in the mentor program: one back in 2009 and one now in 2015.

UT Austin needs to provide better family-leave policies, more opportunities for childcare and more childcare facilities. The University's childcare program is highly competitive and there are not many slots available, which is a barrier faced every year.

#### **Art and Art History**

Please note that non-tenure-track faculty are included above but are often emergency hires and do not necessarily reflect true recruitment goals.

Department is actively seeking female faculty during recruitment. No specific events. I'm not aware of University resources for this issue. Please note that for tenure-track and tenured hires in the past five years, we have hired five females and two males and increased females by one spousal hire.

#### **Asian Studies**

We tend to have a much larger percentage of women applying for non-tenure-track language lectureships in our department than we do men, which accounts for the large number of female applicants. We have never had a problem with attracting or recruiting female applicants.

#### **Cockrell School of Engineering**

For question 5 and 6, applicant information is not very complete as there are a number of applicants for which the gender is unknown for many of the positions. We have a number of positions that were recruited for at more than one level, i.e. associate of early full professor. The number of these positions was split for ease of counting; however, applicant info is hard to discern at which level submitted.

The Cockrell School of Engineering (CSE) requires that if we interview three faculty members for a position at least one has to be a woman or under-represented minority. This has the benefit of underscoring the importance of diversity in the Cockrell School, but also forces search committee to be proactive in going at and seeking and encouraging a diverse applicant pool. Each female recruit meets with representatives from the Engineering Faculty Women's Organization (EFWO) for a luncheon or breakfast meeting as part of the recruiting interview process. This is a gathering with a casual atmosphere and is an important way for the Cockrell School to provide information about the climate for women faculty within the school and about family-friendly policies available on campus, and to demonstrate that a community of female faculty members is active within the school. Outstanding female candidates are highly sought after by universities, so there is much competition in hiring them. Placement of spouses/significant others is an issue in recruitment.

The provost's office does offer some assistance in spousal placement, but it is nowhere near the level provided by some other universities. The Faculty Welfare Committee would serve the University community well by looking at programs at our peer institutions and making recommendations for what UT Austin should be doing to address this issue better.

I am not aware of any available University resources to help increase gender diversity in faculty hiring. However, we have gotten resources from Greg Vincent's office for two hires of minority female candidates. Much of the statistical data that you request should be held centrally by Institutional Equity based on the EEO reports that have to be filed in support of each faculty hire. Using this information may make the responses across schools/colleges more comparable and would rely on institutional data, rather than data held in departments.

#### **Communication Studies Department**

We have not kept records like this. We are always looking for the best person and gender has never been an issue. Not aware of resources at UT Austin. At least half and likely more than half of our TT faculty are female.

### **Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering**

CAEE has done relatively (compared with other engineering sub-disciplines or even peers in CAEE) well attracting female students (now 43% undergraduate). I'd like to think that this is at least in part due to the fact that we have a relatively large number of female faculty members for an engineering department, and these colleagues are doing great research, are highly regarded in their fields (so we highlight them on our social media a lot when they receive awards, large grants, etc.), and are generally very good teachers. We currently have sixteen female faculty members (including one Research Faculty member and two instructors) (between one quarter and one third of our teaching faculty) Women in Engineering program has numerous events throughout the year, and we have tried to make our female faculty members visible through social media, as well as appropriate representation in panel discussions, etc. The most significant is finding ways to reach them and encourage them through databases, e.g., the one that Rice University used to maintain but no longer does. So, we are now working with other databases.

It depends on what the support is. I am not familiar with them and have not been educated on what is available for women in engineering.

Here are some of the resources that we are now using to try to recruit for diversity. The Women in Engineering ProActive Network (WEPAN) has a Faculty for the Future website to post jobs and search for candidate resumes. The Minority PostDoc website has faculty job postings and a database of resumes. Their "Doctoral Directory" has >60% female and >90% domestic post-docs. However, it appears they cater more towards NIH-type jobs as much of their pool are in biology --- less engineering. Nemnet is a resource for minority recruitment. You can post jobs there (academic and non-academic), and they have an online minority candidate resume database (registration required to access). IMDiversity was established by the Black Collegian Magazine. You can post jobs there for \$95-\$150 for a 30- and 60-day posting, respectively. DSP (Doctoral Scholars Program) ONLINE SCHOLAR DIRECTORY

What it is: The Scholar Directory (<http://dspdirectory.sreb.org/>) is a database that showcases more than 1,000 accomplished doctoral scholars and successful PhD recipients (primarily underrepresented minorities) who are committed to pursuing careers in the professoriate. It consists of scholars from:

- The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)
- The National Institutes of Health (Bridges to the Professoriate NIGMS-MARC)
- The Alfred P. Sloan Indigenous Graduate Partnership (SIGP)
- Science Foundation Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP)
- The National Science Foundation Directorate for Social, Behavioral & Economic Sciences (SBE)
- The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Minority Ph.D. Program (SLOAN)

### **ACADEMICCAREERS Diversity Affirmative Action Email Notifications**

When you post a job at AcademicCareers Online (<http://academiccareers.com/index.html>), you receive the diversity package upgrade at no extra charge. The DIVERSITY PACKAGE is currently automatically included with each job posting.

The package includes:

Diversity/Affirmative Action Applicant E-mail Notifications and cross-postings on partner websites  
Posting of the job listing on AcademicCareers.com for either one month to up to three full months.  
Review for marketability, presentation and clarity, of your job listing by our experienced Editorial staff. or each job listing you can select up to four job categories, so it is possible to include more than one search within a single job listing.

### **Department of Educational Administration**

We draw to your attention the fact that no tenure track faculty in the Department of Educational Administration are white males.

### **Health Outcomes and Pharmacy Practice Division, UT College of Pharmacy**

Females constitute the majority of core faculty in this division (eight females, five males). Applicants

will see that based on our website and in talking with our faculty. We have graduate studies/career roundtables each year for our PharmD students- the presence of our female faculty sends a clear message that our unit is a welcoming place for female faculty. The presence of our female faculty at national conferences sends a similar message. Female recruitment hasn't been an issue for this division, although that may not hold true in the bench science divisions.

### **Integrative Biology**

Yes, the Hiring for Diversity Toolkit! Only recently came to our attention. Would love to see training workshops for bias awareness (not another e-module!)

### **IROM: Information, Risk, & Operations Management McCombs School**

We do not have the data on the number of offers and hires for two of the positions that we hired for in Spring of 2013. We include women on the recruiting committees, and seek their involvement in the recruiting process. We support Women in OR/MS (WORMS) which is a sub-unit of INFORMS. There are relatively few women in our field, and there is relatively fierce competition among business schools to attract them. We know of the Gender Equity Task Force but not sure how the resources can help us identify, attract, and retain capable female faculty. We welcome suggestions for how to attract and retain capable female faculty.

### **LBJ School of Public Affairs**

Cannot distinguish between associate/full job openings. Open to both. Data are entered for associate. Recruitment committees always include one or more female faculty member. A recent history of female faculty members denied tenure has impacted us. Not aware of University resources.

### **Pharmacotherapy Division, College of Pharmacy**

Baby Showers.

### **Philosophy**

We only had one open junior position, for which we hired a woman. The remainder were special hires, including spousal hires and opportunistic hires. Our department has a Burns Excellence Endowment intended for additional funding for female faculty and graduate students. This year we initiated a yearly visit from the Office of Equity to discuss gender equity issues with incoming graduate students. We face extreme competition for top female candidates, both faculty and graduate students. Our dean has provided us with resources to help us win many of these competitions with other top universities.

We have hired three female tenure and tenure-track faculty recently, along with a female lecturer. We have lost one tenure-track female faculty member to Stanford, and a lecturer to Brown University (a spousal move). We remain committed to hiring excellent female candidates in coming years, and to making our department a welcoming environment in which all women can flourish.

### **Special Education**

Majority of our hires are females. Wasn't aware of UT Austin resources but definitely interested in learning more.

Appendix A: Email contact list

Note: the request for data was often forwarded to others in units – so this was our initial sample, but a quasi snowball sampling strategy meant that we sometimes ended up hearing from others in the actual report.

<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>University</b>	<b>Email</b>
Patricia	Stout	Director	Stan Richards School of Advertising and Public Relations	pstout@mail.utexas.edu
Sharon	Wood	Dean	Cockrell School of Engineering	swood@utexas.edu

Noel	Clemens	Dept. Chair	Cockrell School of Engineering	clemens@mail.utexas.edu
Andrew	Dunn	Dept. Chair	Cockrell School of Engineering	adunn@utexas.edu
Thomas	Truskett	Dept. Chair	Cockrell School of Engineering	truskett@che.utexas.edu
Richard	Corsi	Dept. Chair	Cockrell School of Engineering	corsi@mail.utexas.edu
Ahmed	Tewfik	Dept. Chair	Cockrell School of Engineering	tewfik@austin.utexas.edu
Jayathi	Murthy	Dept. Chair	Cockrell School of Engineering	jmurthy@me.utexas.edu
Jon	Olson	Dept. Chair	Cockrell School of Engineering	jolson@austin.utexas.edu
Manuel	Justiz	Dean	College of Education	mjustiz@mail.utexas.edu
Randy	Bomer	Dept. Chair	College of Education	bomer@austin.utexas.edu
Cindy	Carlson	Dept. Chair	College of Education	ccarlson@austin.utexas.edu
John	Bartholomew	Dept. Chair	College of Education	jbart@austin.utexas.edu
Mark	O'Reilly	Dept. Chair	College of Education	markoreilly@austin.utexas.edu
Douglas	Dempster	Dean	College of Fine Arts	ddempster@austin.utexas.edu
Jack	Risley	Dept. Chair	College of Fine Arts	jackrisley@austin.utexas.edu
Edmund	Gordon	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	etgordon@mail.utexas.edu
Randy	Diehl	Dean	College of Liberal Arts	diehl@psy.utexas.edu
David	Haase	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	daivd.haase@austin.utexas.edu
Steven	Hoelscher	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	hoelscher@austin.utexas.edu
Anthony	Di Fiore	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	anthony.difiore@austin.utexas.edu
Martha	Selby	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	mas@austin.utexas.edu
Lesley	Dean-Jones	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	ldjones@austin.utexas.edu
Jason	Abrevaya	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	abrevaya@austin.utexas.edu
Elizabeth	Cullingford	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	c.smith-morris@austin.utexas.edu
David	Birdsong	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	birdsong@austin.utexas.edu
Sheryl	Luzzader-Beach	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	slbeach@austin.utexas.edu
Peter	Hess	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	phess@austin.utexas.edu
Robert	Moser	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	rmoser@austin.utexas.edu
Jacqueline	Jones	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	jjones@austin.utexas.edu
Richard	Meier	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	rmeier@austin.utexas.edu
Nicole	Guidotti-Hernández	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	ngh24@austin.utexas.edu
Kamran	Aghaie	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	kamranaghaie@austin.utexas.edu
David	Zinnante	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	david.zinnante@austin.utexas.edu
Brian	Teets	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	co@austin.utexas.edu
David	Sosa	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	david_sosa@austin.utexas.edu
Jacqueline	Woolley	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	woolley@austin.utexas.edu

Martha	Newman	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	newman@austin.utexas.edu
Jeffrey	Walker	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	jswalker@mail.utexas.edu
Mary	Neuburger	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	burgerm@austin.utexas.edu
Robert	Crosnoe	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	crosnoe@austin.utexas.edu
Jossianna	Arroyo-Martínez	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	jarroyo@austin.utexas.edu
Linda	Hicke	Dean	College of Natural Sciences	cnsdean@austin.utexas.edu
Shardha	Jogee	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	sj@astro.as.utexas.edu
Stephen	Martin	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	sfmartin@mail.utexas.edu
Bruce	Porter	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	porter@cs.utexas.edu
Deborah	Jacobvitz	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	debj@austin.utexas.edu
Michelle	Forman	Director/Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	mforman@austin.utexas.edu
Claus	Wilke	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	wilke@austin.utexas.edu
Bob	Dickey	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	robert.dickey@utexas.edu
Alan	Reid	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	areid@math.utexas.edu
Jon	Huibregtse	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	huibregtse@austin.utexas.edu
Dan	Johnston	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	djohnston@mail.clm.utexas.edu
Molly	Bray	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	mbray@austin.utexas.edu
Jack	Ritchie	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	ritchie@hep.utexas.edu
Mike	Daniels	Dept. Chair	College of Natural Sciences	mjdaniels@austin.utexas.edu
Christian	Whitman	Division Head	College of Pharmacy	whitman@austin.utexas.edu
Robert	Williams III	Division Head	College of Pharmacy	bill.williams@austin.utexas.edu
Karen	Vasquez	Division Head	College of Pharmacy	karen.vasquez@austin.utexas.edu
Christopher	Frei	Division Head	College of Pharmacy	freic@uthscsa.edu
Kenneth	Lawson	Division Head	College of Pharmacy	ken.lawson@austin.utexas.edu
M. Lynn	Crimson	Dean	College of Pharmacy	lynn.crimson@austin.utexas.edu
John	Richburg	Division Head	College of Pharmacy	john.richburg@austin.utexas.edu
Claiborne	Johnston	Dean	Dell Medical School	clay.johnston@utexas.edu
Steven	Abrams	Dept. Chair	Dell Medical School	sabrams@austin.utexas.edu
Kevin	Bozic	Dept. Chair	Dell Medical School	kevin.bozic@austin.utexas.edu
Stacey	Chang	Dept. Chair	Dell Medical School	stacey.chang@austin.utexas.edu



Susan	Cox	Dept. Chair	Dell Medical School	suecox@austin.utexas.edu
William	Tierney	Dept. Chair	Dell Medical School	
Amy	Young	Dept. Chair	Dell Medical School	amyyoung@austin.utexas.edu
Peter	Flemings	Chair	Jackson School of Geosciences	pfflemings@jsg.utexas.edu
Sharon	Mosher	Dean	Jackson School of Geosciences	smosher@jsg.utexas.edu
Mrinal	Sen	Chair	Jackson School of Geosciences	mrinal@utexas.edu
Ronald	Steel	Chair	Jackson School of Geosciences	rsteel@jsg.utexas.edu
Robert	Wilson	Dean (Interim)	LBJ School of Public Affairs	dean.r.wilson@austin.utexas.edu
Robert	Freeman	Dept. Chair	McCombs School of Business	robert.freeman@mcombs.utexas.edu
Robert	Prentice	Dept. Chair	McCombs School of Business	rprentice@mail.utexas.edu
Robert	Parrino	Dept. Chair	McCombs School of Business	robert.parrino@mcombs.utexas.edu
Steve	Gilbert	Dept. Chair	McCombs School of Business	steve.gilbert@mcombs.utexas.edu
James	Frederickson	Dept. Chair	McCombs School of Business	james.fredrickson@mcombs.utexas.edu
Jay	Hartzell	Dean	McCombs School of Business	jay.hartzell@mcombs.utexas.edu
Jan	Soetching	Dept. Chair	McCombs School of Business	jan.soechting@mcombs.utexas.edu
Barry	Brummett	Dept. Chair	Moody College of Communication	brummett@austin.utexas.edu
Robert	Brenner	director	Moody College of Communication	rbbrenner@austin.utexas.edu
Paul	Stekler	Dept. Chair	Moody College of Communication	paul.stekler@austin.utexas.edu
James	Booth	Dept. Chair	Moody College of Communication	-booth@austin.utexas.edu
Jay	Bernhardt	Dean	Moody College of Communication	jay.bernhardt@austin.utexas.edu
Frederick	Steiner	Dean	School of Architecture	fsteiner@austin.utexas.edu
Richard	Corsi	Dept. Chair	School of Architecture	corsi@mail.utexas.edu
Andrew	Dillon	Dean	School of Information	adillon@ischool.utexas.edu
David	Adelman	Dept. Chair	School of Law	dadelman@law.utexas.edu
Ward	Farnsworth	Dean	School of Law	wf@law.utexas.edu
Alexa	Stuifbergen	Dean	School of Nursing	astuifbergen@mail.utexas.edu
Luis	Zayas	Dean	School of Social Work	zayas@austin.utexas.edu
Brent	Iverson	Dean	School of Undergraduate Studies	iversonb@austin.utexas.edu
Gage	Pain	Vice President	Student Affairs	gage.paine@austin.utexas.edu
Michael	Stoff	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	planiidirector@austin.utexas.edu
Nicholas	Peppas	Dept. Chair	Cockrell School of Engineering	peppas@che.utexas.edu
Prabhudev	Konana	Dept. Chair	McCombs School of	pkonana@mail.utexas.edu

			Business	
Michelle	Monk	Dept. Chair	Moody College of Communication	michelle.monk@austin.utexas.edu
Robert	Hutchings	Dean	LBJ School of Public Affairs	rhutchings@austin.utexas.edu
Brant	Pope	Dept. Chair	College of Fine Arts	brant@austin.utexas.edu
Brent	Iverson	Dean	College of Natural Sciences	biverson@mail.utexas.edu
Brian	Roberts	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	brian.roberts@austin.utexas.edu,
Charles	Hale	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	crhale@mail.utexas.edu
Christine	Williams	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	cwilliams@austin.utexas.edu
Cory	Juhl	Dept. Chair	College of Liberal Arts	juhl@austin.utexas.edu

#### Appendix B: Information requested

1. Name of your unit:
2. Span of time (in years) you can report on:
3. You sought to fill how many total open positions within that time frame?
4. You sought to fill how many open positions at each rank? (Non tenure-track; Assistant; Associate; and Full professor)
5. Within the time frame noted above, list the number of female applicants at each rank.
6. List the comparable number of male applicants.
7. Number of female candidates brought in for interviews at each rank.
8. Number of male candidates brought in for interviews at each rank.
9. Number of offers made to females at each rank.
10. Number of offers made to males at each rank.
11. Number of females hired at each rank.
12. Number of males hired at each rank.
13. Any comments to help us better understand those numbers?
14. Describe initiatives in your unit or college intended to improve female faculty recruitment.
15. Describe events you sponsor that might make clear to applicants that your college or unit is a welcoming place for female faculty.
16. Describe barriers to female faculty recruitment that you face.
17. What University-level support might help overcome those barriers?
18. Are you familiar with any University resources to help you increase gender diversity? If so, which ones? Have you used those resources in any way? Why or why not?
19. Anything else you want us to know?

LeeAnn Kahlor chair

#### A-6 General Faculty Rules and Governance Committee

The committee's main effort this year was to address "voting rights legislation" for clinical faculty who teach organized classes and hold 50% or greater instructional appointments. Equity would seem to require that clinical faculty with significant instructional contributions across the University should have equivalent voting rights in the General Faculty as non-tenure track faculty with lecturer titles. Largely based on proposals crafted by the Past Committee Chair Hillary Hart, legislation was developed to remedy this voting rights inequity, discussed at the annual meeting of the General Faculty on January 25, 2016, and enthusiastically endorsed though no action was taken as the meeting lacked a quorum. Appropriate legislation was posted to the voting members of the General Faculty on March 31, 2016, and after the requisite three week review period with only two written protests, this legislation, which would effect voting rights for clinical faculty, including voting rights in colleges and schools unless the unit designated more specific criteria, was transmitted to the president and provost for review prior to submission to UT System. The sections of the *Handbook of Operating Procedures* that would be changed are 2-1010 Sec B and 2-1020. Work on developing this enlargement of faculty voting rights has required effort by many colleagues in faculty governance over a multi-year span. A

critical future issue for discussion by the General Faculty Rules and Governance Committee (FR&G) committee will be the integration of the Dell Medical School into faculty governance on our campus.

Issues for the upcoming term of the FR&G Committee include:

- 1) the possibility to coalesce the current two spring faculty elections into a single election;
- 2) review of the restricted nomination process and its current limits;
- 3) the upcoming transition to Workday and having efficient electoral software for both General Faculty and Faculty Council elections.

Following recent committee transition processes, Andrea Gore as past chair of the Faculty Council was designated as the chair of the Faculty Rules and Governance Committee for 2016-17.

William Beckner, chair

#### **A-7 University of Texas Press Advisory Committee**

The University of Texas Press remains an integral part of The University of Texas at Austin's mission to advance and disseminate knowledge through its publications. The committee met nine times during the academic year 2015-16, including the summer, and will meet once again in August immediately prior to the new academic year.

The Press moved during the year from its location across I-35 near the baseball field to make room for the varsity tennis courts that were displaced by the new medical school complex. The Press is now located in the University office building on Lake Austin Boulevard. The transition went smoothly, although the warehouse had to be shifted to the Pickle Center and could no longer be adjacent to the Press. One committee meeting was held at the School of Law while the move/reorganization was underway. The remainders were held at the Press conference room at each location.

The basic format for meetings is the presence of the key staff members of the UT Press along with the committee. Editors present projects for consideration based on reader's reports that have been circulated in advance to the committee along with the table of contents and a description of the manuscript. Questions are asked of the editor by committee members, and there is a general discussion as appropriate for the project. The committee then votes. It is rare for a proposal to be rejected at this point in the process since those proposals recommended to the committee have undergone extensive review by house editors and outside reviewers. Committee members, however, have made recommendations for additional revisions and/or stipulated conditions for approval. Members of the committee are conscientious, and carefully review the materials prior to the meetings.

Michael J. Churgin, chair

### **B. STUDENT SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES COMMITTEES**

#### **B-1 Committee on Financial Aid to Students**

During the 2015-16 academic year, the Committee on Financial Aid to Students (B-1 committee) met to discuss financial aid priorities and policies at the University. We also provided feedback to University administrators, faculty, and students who were assessing financial aid policy. Michael Findley (chair) and John Lassiter (vice chair) served as leadership for the committee. The committee also continued its policy of working closely with administrative staff in the Office of Financial Aid. The Committee on Financial Aid to Students met six times during the school year, once during each long month of the semester sessions. This is the same number of times that the committee met relative to the previous year. The dates for meetings included: September 8, October 16, November 17, February 18, March 24, and April 25. The official charge of the committee is to review financial aid policy, and to hear financial aid appeals related to decisions in the Office of Financial Aid (OFA). At our first meeting in September, we discussed the committee's work from the previous year and tried to set realistic goals for the coming year. We adopted the following list of topics as items of interest for the coming year:

1. Evaluate the financial aid landscape by learning about key needs and resources

2. Consider financial aid fundraising priorities and consider proposing financial aid to be part of next capital campaign
3. Discuss merging of financial aid and admissions/registrar committees
4. Consider tuition benefits for immediate family of staff/faculty

Membership on the committee is made up of faculty, staff and students. We also *have ex-officio* members in the OFA (Diane Todd Sprague), the Graduate School (Marvin Hackert) and the Office of the Dean of Students (Jaden Felix). The guidance of Diane Todd Sprague and the staff of OFA is critical to the working efficiency of the committee. The line of communication in this regard is critical to keeping student and faculty members fully apprised of financial aid policies and needs on campus. The committee specifically addressed the following issues and topics over the course of the academic year:

1. The committee elected John Lassiter as vice chair and Nigel Atkinson as chair elect (from previous year's decision).
2. We discussed considering a merger of our committee with the C-1 committee on Admissions and Registration. The committee decided against pursuing this option.
3. The committee contributed a member to an ad hoc appeal of a financial dispute within athletics.
4. The committee heard three outside presentations on financial aid needs: OFA, Student Success Initiatives, and Study Abroad. These discussions comprised four of our six meetings and culminated in a consensus that significant attention needs to be devoted to fundraising.
5. We drafted and sent a letter to Faculty Council requesting that the FC recommend to the president that fundraising for unmet student financial aid should be included in the next capital campaign. This letter was drafted and sent at the end of the year and is on the agenda for the September 2016 faculty council meeting.
6. The committee discussed the need for tuition benefits for the immediate family members of staff and faculty but felt that there would not be sufficient will to move this discussion ahead.

Michael Findley, chair

## B-2 Recreational Sports Committee

The committee was comprised of the following members:

Dean J. Almy	associate professor, architecture
Mariano A. Aufiero	Sport Club Council representative, biology
Annjene Bunyard	senior administrative associate, radio, television, film
Thomas W. Dison	<i>ex officio</i> , senior associate vice president and director, recreational sports
Jonathan B. Dingwell	associate professor, kinesiology and health education
Brian F. Doherty	senior lecturer, English
Abby Marie Haywood	Intramural Council representative, public relations
Tepera R. Holman	program coordinator, Texas Interdisciplinary Plan
Xiaofen Keating	<i>vice chair</i> , associate professor, curriculum and instruction
Binna Kim	Student Government representative, marketing
Sarfraz Khurshid,	associate professor, electrical and computer engineering
Patrick C. Olson	admissions ambassador & volunteer cord, Office of Admissions
Angeline Close Scheinbaum	associate professor, advertising
Christen Smith	assistant professor, Africa and African diaspora studies
Gayle M. Timmerman	<i>chair</i> , associate professor, nursing
Kevin Y. Yates	Student Government rep., chemical engineering

September 2, 2015 – Election of Vice-Chair

Introductions were made and the election for vice chair took place. Gayle Timmerman explained the duties and qualifications for the position of vice-chair. Xiaofen Keating accepted a nomination, which was seconded by AJ Bunyard. The committee voted unanimously to elect Xiaofen Keating to the position of vice-chair.

*Committee Overview*

Tom Dison provided an overview of Recreational Sports and the role of the Recreational Sports Committee along with a sampling of divisional highlights from 2014-15. The committee watched a PowerPoint presentation, which provided a synopsis of the programs, services and facilities that Recreational Sports offers, as well as a list of its divisional objectives for 2015-16. Packets of divisional publications and related materials were distributed.

October 28, 2015 – Membership and Facility Usage Fees

The committee reviewed and supported Recreational Sports' proposed 2016-17 membership, facility use, and program fee schedules. RecSports' proposed a simplified membership rate structure for 2015-16, which would synchronize the monthly rate with the annual rate, and eliminate the current monthly premium. No increase for Faculty/Staff or retired Faculty/Staff memberships was requested. Current Faculty/Staff rates have been in place since 2009. An increase of approximately 10 percent was requested for Sponsored and Associate memberships (Non-UT Austin affiliates.) A modest increase in towel service, locker rentals, claim fees and guest passes was also recommended. A flat 1.14 percent increase in the facility use fee was also proposed. The increase is intended to compensate for escalating maintenance and utility. Fees are charged for specialty programs to help cover additional expenses in personnel, equipment and transportation. Historically, these fees are set at a local level. The four program areas for which these fees are charged are Intramural Sports, Fitness/Wellness, Outdoor Recreation and Instructional. No increases were proposed for Intramurals. Minor increases were recommended in Fitness/Wellness for personal training, fitness series, and massage; Outdoor Recreation for non UT Austin members, and rock climbing classes and passes; and Instructional for swim lessons.

The committee voted in support of the proposed 2016-17 Membership, Facility Use, and Program fees.

February 2, 2016 – Election of Chair/Financial Presentation

The Faculty Council requested that the committee elect a chair for the following fiscal year at this meeting. Since committee chairs must be faculty members, and no other faculty members were in attendance for this portion of the meeting, those in attendance agreed that nominations and voting for the chair elect would be conducted via email. Gayle Timmerman accepted the nomination to continue as chair for the 2016-17 academic year. She was elected by unanimous vote.

*RecSports Financial Presentation*

Mr. Dison gave an overview of how the Division of Recreational Sports is funded, and how it goes about meeting its expenses. He discussed the concepts and philosophy upon which the division approaches budget issues, and gave an explanation of how the budget process works relative to the Student Services Budget Committee (SSBC). RecSports presented their budget to the SSBC on March 7.

April 25, 2015 – RecSports Development and Wrap-up

Mr. Dison provided a brief history of the RecSports Development Program, and the philosophy behind the approach RecSports takes toward fundraising. He explained the rationale behind RecSports' decision to pursue corporate sponsorships and partnerships, and the difference between the two. He also described the methods that RecSports used in the valuation of assets, and the progress that the division has made thus far.

Committee Activities/Meeting Topics for the 2016-17

---

- Introductions and committee overview
- Election of vice-chair
- Review of divisional accomplishments from 2015-16 and goals for upcoming year
- Recreational Sports' budget requests for 2017-18
- Membership, Facility Usage, and Program Fees for 2017-18
- Updates and Announcements
- Special Topics as needed

Gayle Timmerman, chair

**B-3 Student Life Committee**

No report submitted.

Diane Schallert, chair

**B-4 Student Athletes and Activities Committee**

The University of Texas at Austin Student Athletics and Activities Committee met during the fall semester (Sept 14, 2015) and discussed several topics of general interest that we felt addressed current faculty concerns. Our goal was to identify and suggest changes or improvements to student athletes, activities, and communication and establish formal communication channel between the faculty and student athletes and to advise the president on matters pertaining to student athletes. The B-4 committee is a new General Faculty Standing Committee.

At the fall meeting, it is was also reiterated that the composition of the committee would be members elected at-large from and by the voting members of the General Faculty for three-year staggered terms. Two faculty members shall be appointed for one-year terms by the president, one each from among the faculty currently serving on the Intercollegiate Athletics Council for Men and the Intercollegiate Athletics Council for Women. Two student athlete members, one each from men's and women's athletics, will be appointed by the president from a list submitted by the Student Athletes Advisory Council. In addition, every year the chair of the Faculty Council shall appoint two voting faculty members of the Faculty Council for one-year terms. The Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) shall serve on the committee in an advisory capacity. Each year, the committee shall elect its own chair and vice chair, who shall be voting faculty members of the committee. The faculty-appointed representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) will be invited to serve as an ex-officio member.

In early December 2015, there was communication with Noël Busch-Armendariz (School of Social Work) concerning the launch of a University-wide (system-wide) study on survivor of child sexual abuse. There will be a great deal of empirical data later in 2015-16. This communication occurred after a conversation a few weeks before about the academic needs of our athletes. Dr. Busch-Armendariz explained she is a strong advocate that the faculty could/should address our athlete as *whole* individuals.

In early Spring 2016, there was communication with Andrea Gore (Faculty Council chair, professor, pharmacology) concerning reaction to the Marsh report and to coordinate efforts with the Faculty Council Executive Committee (FCEC).

In early March, the chair of the B-4 committee met with Athletic Director Mike Perrin for a one-hour meeting. At that meeting, a number of issues were discussed by the chair including:

1. Many recruited athletes are members of minority groups- the College of Education typically has more "minority" students than other colleges, i.e., "a place where I can find others like me."
2. College of Education has more minority faculty, I believe, than most other colleges on campus, i.e., "I can talk to a faculty member who is someone like me about my academic program and issues."
3. College of Education departments and faculty, unlike other academic areas at University recognize that there is a need to examine more than an SAT score or GPA when admitting a student. That is to say there is recognition that there is tremendous variance in the quality of schools and school districts across the state and nation and often these student athletes come from less than the best schools that have limited support of the schools, school districts, and communities where they live. But, there are high standards of University GPA, 2.5?, prior to admission to the College of Education professional preparation sequence.
4. Many student athletes see themselves involved in athletics through out their careers, e.g., coaches, involved with young people, and organizations that serve them, etc. Coaching is in reality "teaching" and College of Education trains teachers; and, in coaching, athletic careers, etc., involvement with young people is common and expected. That is the same expectation of College of Education majors.
5. Coaches are often teachers in high schools and coaching has been a part of the experience and role

model for student athletes. Such athletes want to be professional and college of ed is a professional school that offers a professional license, i.e., teaching certificate, and access to a job as a professional.

6. College of Education has links to other colleges and programs and tailors degrees to the student athlete, e.g., college of business, sports management. Student athlete may matriculate through College of Education but experiences courses, professors, etc., in other disciplines and colleges.
7. College of Education typically does not enroll the student until after freshman or sophomore years, i.e., is an “upper division” major. So student athlete has experienced much of the University liberal arts and sciences prior to the college of education.
8. Many of the tutors and others in the academic support services provided athletes are college of education graduate students and have special knowledge and skill for the “struggling student,” i.e., Department of Special Education.

Some members of the B4 committee were in attendance when Mike Perrin met with the full Faculty Council on Monday March 21 (meetings begin 2:15 pm) in MAI 212.

Several attempts were made to gather the committee together in the spring of 2016. Unfortunately, a spring meeting did not occur. The chair takes responsibility for this and regrets a meeting could not be organized. In the future, the plan will be to establish standing monthly meeting dates (i.e. second Friday of the month) as sending polls around for availability simply was not effective.

Anthony J. Petrosino, chair

## **C. INSTITUTIONAL POLICY OR GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES**

### **C-1 Admissions and Registration Committee**

The committee met four times during this academic year in the conference room of the Stan Richards School of Advertising and Public Relations.

The first meeting was a brief meeting when the charge of the committee was discussed and the vice chair for the committee was elected. The vice chair is Professor Jonathan Pierce-Shimomura.

The committee agreed to consider two issues for discussion during this academic year. The first issue was to determine what should be the minimum number of hours a transfer student should have completed prior to being considered for admission at the University. The second issue was to review the University Adds and Drops policy. The committee discussed and voted on the first issue, but could not complete the discussion of the second issue due to lack of time.

During its meetings and deliberations, the committee was assisted by the director of admissions, Dr. Ben Corpus, the registrar, Mr. Shelby Stanfield, and several other members of their staff. We are thankful for the support and the data provided to the committee by them, their assistance was extremely helpful to our deliberations.

The first issue considered resulted in a recommended change to the Transfer policy as follows:

In most circumstances to be eligible for transfer admission consideration, an applicant must:

1. Have graduated from high school or earned a GED,
2. Have enrolled in an institution of higher education following high school graduation or receipt of the GED, and
3. Have earned eighteen to thirty semester hours of transferable coursework at another college or University.

While thirty semester hours of transfer credit is recommended for transfer applicants, students with at least twenty-four hours of credit will be considered based on the strength of their application and available spaces in the incoming class. In rare cases based on exceptional circumstances, students with fewer than twenty-four semester hours of credit may be considered for transfer admission under special

review by appeal to the Director of Admissions.

*Rationale for the Policy Change*

Adjusting the number of required transfer credits for transfer applicants will:

- Align our policy with those of comparable higher education institutions (most require one year, two semesters or twenty-four hours of transferable coursework)
- Potentially increase the number, quality and diversity of the transfer applicant pool
- Provide flexibility in redefining transfer pathways
- Allow for consideration of applicants with fewer than thirty semester hours of completed coursework while retaining an emphasis on the importance of progress toward degree completion

Of the fourteen members on the committee, it was a unanimous vote in favor of the resolution.

It is the committee's understanding that this resolution needs to be approved by the registrar's office, the director of admissions and by the Faculty Council Executive Committee (FCEC). We will forward the proposal for approval to the registrar's office and the director of admissions, and we are requesting that this item be put on the FCEC agenda for June 3, at which time we will be glad to provide the FCEC with the necessary background for its discussion.

We recommend that during the next academic year, the C-1 Admissions and Registration Committee consider the existing Adds and Drops policy in order to assess if it is appropriate to insure that students are allowed to add courses needed to complete their graduation in four years.

The committee also thanks Susan Deem for her invaluable support. I want to personally thank all the committee members for their participation and feedback.

Respectfully submitted,



Isabella C.M. Cunningham  
Professor and Stan Richards  
Chair in Advertising and Public Relations Strategy

cc: Chesney, Lee R.	Jones, Leonie N.
Cox, Martin R.	Balbas, Jasmine C.
Davis, Katherine M.	Bengan, Harvey
Ferreira-Buckley, Linda	Dick, Jeffrey E.
Katz, Lynn E.	Leonard, Sara E.
Bertelsen, Lance	Roberts, David A.
Pierce-Shimomura, Jonathan T.	

Isabella C. Cunningham, chair

## **C-2 University Academic Calendar Committee**

### Summary

In 2015-16, the University Academic Calendar Committee did not take up any new business.

### Election of Chair Elect

On February 2, 2016, Dr. Paula Murray was nominated for the position of chair elect for the 2016-17 academic year and was subsequently elected by the committee on a no-protest basis.

David S. Stein, chair

## **C-4 Educational Policy Committee**

The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) enjoyed a productive year and facilitated the advancement of a number of issues in University policy. This report outlines those accomplishments as well as looking forward to topics we anticipate in the months to come after this report is submitted.



*Inclusion of students with associates degrees in Designated College Scholars program.* The committee recommended that *General Information Catalog* (GIC) language regarding “Designated College Scholars” be changed to reflect that students who hold a bachelors degree were ineligible, rather than students who hold any undergraduate degree. This change made it possible for students with an associates degree to be eligible for this honor. The revision was approved by the Faculty Council and the president.

*Allowing Associate Deans as signatories on certain significant course record changes.* At the request of the Policy Implementation Group, the committee recommended a change in the wording of the GIC to make it possible for an appropriate associate dean to sign, instead of the dean, in cases of appeal for retroactive withdrawal, delete drops, or appeal for change of a final grade. The purpose was to make the official policy reflect the practical reality of administration. The revision was approved by the Faculty Council and the president.

*Revisions to the transcript-recognized minors policy.* The policy passed in 2014-15 about transcriptable minors created concerns and questions for international language departments attempting to create minors. The EPC recommended – and the Faculty Council and president approved – a change to the GIC that created a separate policy paragraph for foreign languages that would require a minimum of fifteen and a maximum of twenty-one hours in those minors (three hours above the maximum for other minors), with nine hours beyond first year competence in the language and at least three hours of upper division course work.

*Revision to Retroactive Withdrawal policy.* The Registrar’s Policy Implementation Group requested some changes to the GIC language on retroactive withdrawals that would maintain consistency across the University while also supporting deans’ offices in using retroactive withdrawals when a student’s circumstances are appropriate. The change uses the concept of “reasonableness” to provide deans’ offices with professional discretion, while also requiring the use of documentation of the student’s circumstances from appropriate professionals – walking a line between opening up the possibility of using the withdrawal while maintaining consistency across the campus. The EPC recommended the change to the GIC, and it was approved by Faculty Council and the president.

*Changes discussed but not acted upon: Extension of eCIS survey period; Faculty dissent in Student Judicial Services (SJS) cases.* Because some faculty members had difficulty getting a high rate of return on eCIS surveys, they requested that the committee consider extending the survey period. In discussion, the committee determined that there were preferable ways of increasing the return rate, which have been made available as advice to faculty. An issue also arose of SJS cases of scholastic dishonesty where a student *Q*-drops the class, now without faculty signature, and the *Q*-drop may be processed without consultation with the faculty member. The registrar’s office believes this can be dealt with through administrative practice of touching base with faculty members before a withdrawal is completed, and the committee determined that no policy change is needed at present.

*Anticipated agenda item.* In fall of 2016, the EPC will be considering policy requiring a minimum duration for transfer courses.

Seema Agarwala is chair elect for 2016-17, and the committee thanks her for her service to come.

Respectfully submitted,  
Randy Bomer, chair

Randy Bomer, chair

#### **C-5 Faculty Building Advisory Committee**

As you know, in recent years the responsibility of the Faculty Building Advisory Committee (FBAC) has evolved. Much of the old responsibility of the FBAC as the campus building committee has shifted to the University Master Planning Committee and the FBAC is now more of an advocacy voice on

faculty input on building priorities, recommendations and directions for future planning.

As your representative this year, I have served on the Campus Master Plan Committee, the Facilities and Space Council and as a member of the Ad Hoc Building Committee for the proposed Graduate Student Housing Complex. As a member of these committees, I can attest to the strong influence of both the Campus Master Plan and the Dean's Council in setting priorities for new and remodeled facilities. The University has doubled its square footage to an area of seventeen million square feet and 170 buildings in recent years

We met twice as a committee in the fall and came to a general understanding that we could be most helpful if we were to survey the general faculty to determine the faculty vision or visions for priorities for new and remodeled facilities.

Subsequently several ideas have been explored as a means to achieve a more comprehensive survey of faculty priorities. These ideas have ranged from a town hall meeting format to a campus-wide online survey using the faculty list serve address. The consensus of faculty response seems to favor the idea of a campus wide faculty survey in the fall of 2016 by the University of Texas at Austin Department of Statistics and Data Sciences Statistical Consulting Group. The assumption is that this survey would ask faculty questions like, do you have adequate and available classroom spaces, lab spaces, study hall spaces, meeting spaces, lounge spaces, library etc.? Are classroom spaces designed and equipped for 21<sup>st</sup> century interactive teaching and learning? Do our facilities have a pedagogical content?

This spring President Fenves announced the formation of a 2016 Space Allocation Study. The study is to be an administrative evaluation of the UT Austin's administrative and library spaces to determine if they could be better allocated to our pursuit of the University's core academic mission. The administrative team under the leadership of Vice President for University Operations Pat Clubb will "work with a team of experienced space consultants over the summer to review the University's physical capacity in light of current and projected needs, while giving thoughtful consideration to the creation of environments conducive to next-generation learning and interdisciplinary research. The study, which should conclude in fall 2016, will initially focus on: the Flawn Academic Center, the Development Building, Littlefield Home and Carriage House, Main Building and Tower, North Office Building A, UT Administration Building, West Pickle Research Building, and the University of Texas Libraries.

The FBAC is asking that the Space Allocation consultants meet with the Faculty Building Advisory Committee this summer in order to have faculty input into their recommendations. As a world class University, we the faculty understand that by being at the cutting edge of research we become more informed and better teachers. The faculty should be responsible for our curriculum, which has a direct impact on priorities on how well campus space is allocated and utilized.

The physical campus is a potent instrument of the education process, providing the setting for formal learning experiences and for the informal encounters between students, faculty, staff and guests that are the hallmark of the University experience. As we transition from the chalk and talk lecture hall format of the past generation to the interactive networking classrooms of the next generation, thoughtful consideration to the creation of environments conducive to next-generation learning and interdisciplinary research is essential.

In the spirit of this new outlook of our evolving curriculum and how well the University of Texas at Austin's new and renovated space priorities reflect our core academic mission, the FBAC researched the question of faculty input into the design process of space allocation priorities and consulted several of our peer institutions and determined that the committee should focus on two primary questions: How does Facilities Planning prioritize the backlog of critical maintenance and renovation of our existing facilities? And how can faculty be involved in prioritizing the next generation of learning spaces?

These two questions are the recommendation for the direction of the FBAC in the coming 2016-2017

academic year and would form the basis for a survey to better determine the opinions of faculty, staff and student stakeholders on the priorities for new and renovated spaces on campus.

### **1. How does Facilities Planning prioritize the backlog of critical maintenance and renovation of our existing facilities?**

As highlighted by the recommendations of the University of Texas Commission of 125, the University has a backlog of critical maintenance and renovation projects, largely the result of the aging of the campus and inadequate resources in recent years for construction of new buildings and renovations on the main campus. Furthermore, The University should use its facilities more efficiently and make better use of existing campus buildings by making buildings more multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary. Emphasize flexible use, unless building specialization is essential.

FBAC members generally believe there is a shortage of classroom and laboratory spaces as well as limited land for construction of new buildings on the main campus. Furthermore, the University should use its facilities more efficiently. Not only is there a shortfall in space for classrooms and committee meetings; there is also an extreme “siloing” of space such that rooms “owned” by departments or colleges are fiercely guarded. Some of those spaces sit empty for 95% of the time but cannot be used by others, including those who may even be within the same building, for the eventuality that someone in the home department might want to have a meeting someday.

### **2. What are the next generation learning spaces?**

A key driver in new learning spaces is the need to accommodate new technologies including wireless access, connections to the campus network, and provisions for updated hardware for faculty and students. However the role of these technologies in teaching and learning, as contrasted with their roles in faculty members’ research or student’s social lives, is often not clearly articulated in the renovation or construction plans. A number of underlying assumptions may prompt the way in which technology is integrated into learning spaces and the physical layout of those spaces: assumptions about what classrooms should look like, based either on existing models or on ideas of what changes are needed; assumptions about faculty readiness to change their tried-and-true methods of teaching and how they might do so if technologies are more readily available in the classrooms and assumption about what role technology has in the improvement of learning. Some key institution players may see classroom facilities projects as opportunities to institute reforms in teaching and learning, based on the finding of reports that advocate pedagogies emphasizing such elements as active and social learning. But such expectations may not be clearly articulated to and may not be shared by faculties, who have the main responsibility for teaching. The result is often a gap between what is perceived to be the value of the renovation of classroom design or the next-generation of learning spaces that actually results. If a costly renovation of a classroom building and the installation of smart technology results merely in faculty using PowerPoint presentations rather than overhead projector slides in their lectures, administrators might well question whether there will be a healthy return on investment. If faculty are not involved in the programming of new and renovated classrooms, there may be only a refreshing of existing classroom design without allowance for significant pedagogical changes that could have a major impact on student learning.

#### **2a. How do you involve faculty in programming new academic space priorities?**

It is important that planners understand the faculty members’ pedagogical style and preference and their use of technology in research, teaching and learning, in preparation for changes in the learning space. Curriculum review in conjunction with space planning have the opportunity to achieve significant pedagogical change, where the learning needs of the discipline drive the planning process. Discussions of instructional pedagogy should precede the design and prototyping of the next generation of learning spaces and that faculty and students should have genuine input into the process. A successful process must address faculty motivation for making curriculum and/or pedagogy changes in the design of new learning spaces. Faculty may want to improve content learning, or advanced development in both writing and media skills or critical thinking skills. For example, students may use textbooks and online sources and bring that knowledge to the classroom to collaboratively build new ideas, connections and applications in an interactive setting. Students sit in groups at tables equipped with personal laptops or a personal digital assistant (PDA). The PDA’s and laptops are connected to screens so that the classroom is ringed with displays of what the students are developing. The professor

can send images of case study examples to all the students and make the round to the groups during the class, answering questions and making suggestions. Ideally the motivation to teach students in this new way using technology, coupled with appropriately configured classroom spaces, could lead to improved educational learning.

### **2b. How do faculty go beyond the initial planning process of the next generation of learning spaces?**

How do we go beyond the initial planning process to integrate 21<sup>st</sup> century technology into the learning space beyond installing the basic infrastructure so that faculty will have the flexibility and freedom to use technology how they want and in ways not yet imagined? Faculty should work with planners in order to implement changes in pedagogical approaches and to learn the potential of new technology in their classrooms and laboratories. Many faculty members are overwhelmed by the need to use different equipment in classrooms and by the challenges of keeping up with web technicians, course management systems, and various software. The expertise of library and computing staff, which could work with both faculty and students, could free faculty members from needing to be experts on every aspect of new technical media aspects of assignments.

Planners should confer with faculty for new spaces by conducting faculty surveys, visits to curriculum committee meetings, and interviews. In partnership with faculty, the Center for Teaching and Learning and IT services could help with assisting faculty with improving our utilization of technology in teaching and new learning.

Many faculty do not want to invest time in changing their teaching style to use technology merely because it is in fashion, nor do they want to integrate collaborative learning into class time simply because they believe that students like it. They do want to address perceived problems such as weak critical thinking or weak research or writing skills, and to take advantage of perceived opportunities, such as increasing student engagement or giving students experience with techniques currently used in the discipline's work. For these reasons, faculty need to be deeply engaged in the planning process for the next- generation of classroom and laboratory learning spaces.

### **2c. How do we connect informal learning spaces with faculty and students?**

Faculty input in the planning process for new construction or renovation of informal learning spaces such as computer labs or learning commons must not be overlooked. Faculty expect students to spend more time learning related to the academic subjects outside the classroom than they do inside the classroom. More learning commons are required for collaborative student work and access to technologies, along with support from IT services. Planners, who often have generic ideas of what students might want to accomplish in such spaces, often lack knowledge of students' specific curricular needs. Although faculty may be included on planning committees for these informal learning spaces on campus, their numbers are usually too small to represent all the disciplines whose students might use the spaces.

Because of the generally mild weather in Austin, Texas, outdoor-learning spaces for student gathering has great potential as learning spaces. Ever since Thomas Jefferson's design for the University of Virginia which was based on an "academical" village, the concept of academic malls, quadrangles, and courtyards has had a strong tradition in the planning of American universities. As the need for more interdisciplinary learning becomes more imperative, the programming of shared outdoor spaces becomes a renewed opportunity for programming informal outdoor-learning spaces. The FBAC endorsement of the proposed Speedway Mall is but one example of UT Austin faculty understanding of the academic importance of the need for common learning spaces.

### **Conclusion**

Establishing good communication so that faculty will understand what spaces, technologies and IT services are available and how these all might best be used can help maximize the optimal utilization of new or renovated next-generation learning spaces.

The University of Texas at Austin should clearly articulate its learning objectives and then place a high

priority on including curriculum redesign in the planning process for new learning spaces. Faculty who are engaged in pedagogy, along with others who are concerned with the research, teaching and learning aspects of the space, should play a central, not peripheral, role in planning groups. Part of this process should involve faculty input on the design of the next generation of learning spaces.

It is also necessary to document the analytics to demonstrate returns on the priority of investments in next-generation learning spaces. And faculty may welcome opportunities to rethink their teaching styles and ways in which they achieve their learning objectives if the proper supports are put in place.

These findings will be conveyed to the 2016-17 Faculty Building Advisory Committee with the recommendation of a survey to determine the faculty opinions on priorities for new and renovated next-generation learning spaces for the University of Texas at Austin.

Respectfully,

Michael Garrison  
Professor of Architecture  
2015-2016 Chair  
Faculty Building Advisory Committee  
The University of Texas at Austin

Michael L. Garrison, chair

#### **C-6 International Programs and Studies Committee**

No report submitted.

Cesar A. Salgado chair

#### **C-7 University of Texas Libraries Committee**

The committee met four times in the fall semester and three times in the spring. We greatly appreciate the help of UT Libraries staff in support of our work.

The committee focused on three main topics this year: UT Libraries Vice Provost and Director Lorraine Haricombe's vision for transformative change; the recent launch of the Learning Commons; and UT Libraries' open access initiatives.

**Vision for transformative change.** During the December 7 meeting, UT Libraries Vice Provost and Director Lorraine Haricombe outlined her vision for transforming the UT Libraries to address changes in the educational environment, including changes in the higher education ecosystem, professional trends, national policies, accountability in the higher education ecosystem, and increased use of technology in teaching and learning. Dr. Haricombe identified *deeper collaboration* as a unifying theme. She discussed UT Libraries' moves to reposition for these changes, including restructuring and organizing teams around specific challenges.

**Learning Commons.** During the October 5 meeting, Michele Ostrow, Head of Teaching and Learning Services for UT Libraries, provided an overview and demonstration of the purpose and features of the Learning Commons. The Learning Commons involved renovation to the Perry-Castaneda Library, making it a better place for students to gather, collaborate, and learn; it was completed at the beginning of the fall 2015 semester. The committee discussed the Learning Commons and its future potential.

**Open Access initiatives.** During meetings on March 28 and April 18, the committee discussed UT Libraries' options for promoting its Open Access initiatives, including Texas Scholarworks. During the March 28 meeting, Colleen Lyon, Scholarly Communications Librarian, described how these initiatives allow UT Austin faculty and students (both graduate and undergraduate) to post scholarly works (including published and unpublished research articles, data, and instructional materials) without violating copyright. As such, these initiatives allow UT Austin scholars to share their work without institutional subscriptions to the forums in which they publish it; allow University scholars to

publicize their work online and in third-party communities (such as Academia.edu and ResearchGate) without violating copyright; and allow under-resourced institutions globally to benefit from the University's research. During the March 28 and April 18 meetings, the committee identified a number of ways to promote the OA initiatives, including the following:

- Work with departments and centers to collect researcher CVs for UT Libraries to use in identifying and pulling in open access articles;
- Raise faculty awareness by running regular promotional articles;
- Reach out to Title VI center directors, perhaps through an orientation session or workshop, to explain how much the repository could increase access for scholars in their subject regions;
- Consider promoting Texas Scholarworks through Facebook and promoting specifically to graduate students as they begin their academic careers;
- Consider working with colleges to have undergraduate honors theses deposited;
- Reach out to graduate advisors to educate graduate students on the possibilities of OA;
- Reach out to the Graduate School to promote OA as a way to position graduate students, possibly in conjunction with solutions (such as Scalar) for highlighting interconnected work in seminars.

In conclusion, the University Libraries Committee has addressed its charge by becoming more informed about the activities of the University Libraries and the influences on its work. Members look forward to continuing to work and support with University Libraries staff, especially Dr. Haricombe, Vice Provost and Director. We support and congratulate the Library in serving as a hub for learning on campus.

Clay Spinuzzi, chair  
Barbara Bintliff, chair-elect

Clay Spinuzzi, chair

### **C-8 Parking and Traffic Appeals Panel**

The Parking and Traffic Appeals Panel reviews the second level of appeals of fines for enforcement of the University's parking regulations. Persons receiving parking citations may first appeal to the Parking and Traffic Services staff, and if not satisfied with its decision, may appeal to the Panel to consider their cases for reduction or dismissal of the fines.

The Panel is comprised of six review panels, with six or seven members each from the General Faculty, staff, and students. Each review panel considers five to ten appeals in two or three weeks. Panelists use their UT EIDs and passwords to access the web-based site to review the cases. Cases consist of evidence presented by Parking and Traffic Services staff and appellants. After reviewing the cases, panelists enter their votes to uphold, reduce, or dismiss the fines. The chairperson reviews panelists' votes and comments and makes the final decision. There is no further means to appeal beyond the Panel.

Ronald Anderson was elected chairperson for 2015-16, and Richard Lewis was elected vice chair. The chair extends his appreciation to panel members for their thoughtful and timely reviews. He also thanks Michelle Habeck, previous chair, for her assistance and the Parking and Traffic Services staff for its tireless service.

To date, the panel has considered 294 cases. Of these, the data below address the panel's overall decisions.

Denied—Citation Upheld	167	56.80%
Fine Reduced	92	31.29%
Warning	21	7.14%
Upheld—Citation Dismissed	<u>14</u>	<u>4.76%</u>
	294	100% (rounded)

Respectfully submitted,  
Ronald Anderson, Chair

Ronald B. Anderson, chair

### **C-9 Transportation Policies Committee**

The committee met two times during the year and had one informal e-mail vote. The main issues we discussed were construction of the Speedway Mall, other construction, D Permits and HIPPA/privacy issues, bike sharing, and shuttles. The Committee will continue to monitor these issues, especially the construction and changes to the “D” permits. The Committee recommended adding a member from the Dell Medical School.

Donna DeCesare was elected chair of the committee for 2016-7 and Pat Somers was elected chair-in-waiting.

1. Shuttles – 2 years left on contract, year-to-year approval
  - a. Increased rates with better Cap Metro technology to measure number of riders
  - b. New buses have minimal UT branding (so that they can be swapped out with the general Cap Metro pool of buses; otherwise we are stuck with UT buses until they die)
  - c. Approx. 50% of regular fare
2. Bike share program
  - a. Soft launch in Aug. 2016 for opening of Dell Medical
  - b. Hopefully, no charge for service, need ID and credit card to reserve with deposit (when returned charges reversed)
3. TDLR (consultant for ADA parking)
  - a. No longer able to work with UT
  - b. Issue over number of ADA spaces and configuration (parallel v. head-in parking)
4. Speedway Mall (for information, search UT website for “Speedway Project”)
  - a. Plaza from MLK to ½ block from Dean Keaton
  - b. F-11 spaces located to garages
  - c. ADA spaces relocated to 21<sup>st</sup> Street (1:1 ratio for replacement)
    - i. Will face issues in future with moving ADA farther from center of campus and providing para-transit
  - d. Issue of deliveries (for example, towels to Gregory Gym)
  - e. Good reception from campus
    - i. Improvement of safety for pedestrians, bikers, buses, and drivers
5. D Parking Permits
  - a. The committee voted by e-mail to recommend that UT discontinue issuing a “D” permit, which involves UT seeking and keeping HIPPA-protected medical information in the parking office files. Instead, beginning in Fall of 2016, UT will only require a state issued handicapped parking permit and any UT permit to park in “D” spaces.

Patricia A. Somers, chair

### **C-10 Recruitment and Retention Committee**

**FUNCTION:** To address the matter of recruitment and retention of minority students and to advise the Faculty Council and the president on constructive solutions to alleviate the problems of recruitment and retention

**COMPOSITION:** Four voting members of the General Faculty for three-year staggered terms, one departmental faculty minority liaison officer for a three-year term, and two staff members (at least one shall be an academic advisor or graduate coordinator) for two-year staggered terms. Three students shall be appointed by the president from a panel of names submitted by Student Government and one from a panel submitted by the Graduate Student Assembly. The coordinator of the Sanger Learning and Career Center and three members of the administration shall be appointed by the president for one-year terms. In addition, every year the chair of the Faculty Council shall appoint two voting faculty members of the Faculty Council for one-year terms. Each year, the committee shall elect its own chair and vice chair who shall be voting faculty members of the committee. The vice president for diversity and community engagement, a representative from the Black Alumni Association, and a representative from the Hispanic Alumni Association shall serve as ex officio members without votes.

**REPORT:**

In 2015-16, the main efforts of the committee were to understand the trends in enrollment and graduation and the University's efforts to retain matriculated historically under-represented students through to graduation.

This committee re-interprets its function almost every year. Two years ago, the annual report proposed a change in function, but there seems to have been no action taken. Last year, the committee apparently did not meet at all. Most members of this year's committee were not well informed on our subject, so we spent the fall looking up statistics and capturing trends in enrollment. We found that the total numbers of minority students are very slowly increasing in percentage of student body, but the numbers of African American students lag behind the other increases. Even with the increases in minority students, their percentage is way behind the projected population ratios, as the percentage of minority citizens is increasing much faster than the percentage of minority students.

We decided to focus our spring activities on existing retention programs and the staff members on the committee introduced us to the Student Success Initiatives, which serve all students, including minority students. In the current climate and legal situation former minority directed programs have been subsumed under a general University focus on increasing the four-year graduation rate. We look forward to reports on their outcomes. Until now, one key observation is that these activities have become almost the sole purview of the administration (at various levels) with little to no involvement of the General Faculty.

We proposed a resolution to the Faculty Council praising the retention programs but calling for a better "yield" from automatically admitted minority students and offered faculty help in recruiting, asking for regular review by the committee of the progress of the various programs which affect minority recruitment and retention, and declaring faculty interest and offering faculty involvement. It was presented to the Faculty Council on April 11. Because of lawyer concerns with the wording, the resolution was withdrawn for legal consultation. On May 2, the Faculty Council unanimously passed this lawyer-vetted resolution:

Be it resolved:

1. The Faculty Council endorses the Provost's and other administrative efforts to increase student success. In order for the Faculty to participate fully in efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of under-represented students, the faculty should be kept informed regularly of current administrative efforts and progress in supporting student academic success.
2. The Faculty supports the continued application of resources to recruit and enroll students from those already admitted through the admissions process, which enhances the ability of all of our students to receive the full educational benefits of diversity.
3. The Faculty Council is committed to diversity, inclusion, and a welcoming environment at UT Austin.

**Suggestions for 2016-2017**

The 2013-14 report suggested a change in function. We proposed a Faculty Council Resolution that gets at the same thing – a sense that the function of the committee is ill-designed and explains the common use of "moribund" in the committee reports of more than one year. Though approaching the problem in different ways, both committees have suggested that it makes more sense for this committee to become a committee that monitors and reviews on behalf of the academic faculty. It makes no sense for a committee like this to propose "solutions" when there is a large apparatus of professional staff persons in the administrative offices whose job it is to do this. We propose that in 2016-2017 the committee change the function of the committee to make it more relevant as a policy and governance committee or ask to eliminate the committee. For either choice, it will be necessary to go through the proper channels (instead of making a statement in an annual report).

If the committee decides to continue, this year's committee recommends:

1. establishment of this committee as one that demands outcome reports from the various University admission and retention programs. Are they effective in their purpose relative to increasing the diversity, inclusion, and welcoming environment of the University.
2. a change in language from "minority" to "under-represented" students.



3. a change in composition to have more faculty members on the faculty committee.

Madeline M. Maxwell, chair

### **C-11 Research Policy Committee**

The Research Policy Committee (RPC ) held several meetings this academic year. A summary of activities and recommendations follows.

The C-11 RPC Committee held our initial meeting on September 14, 2015. The meeting was well-attended, with nine members present. Jonathan Dingwell was elected chair, with the group present deciding to determine a vice-chair at a later date. The group discussed several issues to consider addressing for the year, including:

1. **Crowd-Funding of Scientific Research:** UT Austin currently has no policies related to faculty or student use of crowd funding to support research efforts and the growing interest in and access to crowd funding resources by faculty and/or students makes this an important and timely topic to address.
2. **Data Accessibility & Management:** NSF, NIH and other federal agencies more and more now require “data management plans” to be submitted with grant proposals. More journals (e.g., PLoS) are starting to require authors to make their *data* available as a condition of publication. It is not clear what policies UT Austin has or may need to develop to help support UT Austin faculty to help comply with these new efforts.
3. **Administrative Burdens on Faculty for Conducting Research:** Previously, Dr. Susan Sedwick from OSP had brought to the RPC’s attention that investigators spend up to 42% of the “research” time dealing with administrative tasks not related to the conduct of the research itself. The committee discussed identifying ways the University might help to reduce the administrative burden to faculty conducting research.

Dr. Dingwell met with Dr. Juan Sanchez, and Dr. Sanchez strongly suggested that the crowd funding issues was an issue in great need of addressing. Dr. Dingwell shared this information with the committee via email and did some background research on the topic. The RPC met again November 17 and decided to take on this issue for the year. Nine members of the RPC committee, and also Dr. Sanchez, attended the meeting.

In January 2016, Dr. Dingwell and several members of the RPC attended an “information session” hosted by UT Austin’s local crowd funding efforts, “HornRaiser”, being conducted by the UT Office of Development to learn more about how the HornRaiser process works. In February 2016, Dr. Dingwell and Dr. Davida Charney met with Marsha Reardon and Adrian Mathys of UT Development to discuss ways to improve collaboration and communication between HornRaiser and UT Research.

#### Definition of “Crowd Funding”:

With regard to scientific research work, there are two primary streams:

**“Crowd Sourcing”** – Refers to getting other people involved in doing research activities themselves. Members of the general public contribute to scientific discovery directly through contributions of their time and effort, but not by contributing money. The US federal government offers resources to help support this type of work: <https://crowdsourcing-toolkit.sites.usa.gov/>

**“Crowd Funding”** – Refers to researchers using on line resources to raise money to help conduct scientific research. In this regard, Crowd Funding is separate and fundamentally different from “crowd sourcing.”

#### Description and Scope of the Issue / Problem:

Crowd funding has been popularized by endeavors like Kickstarter (<https://www.kickstarter.com/>). However, in recent years, a number of private organizations dedicated to crowd funding of scientific research have emerged, as discussed here:

<http://www.wired.com/2015/04/crowdfunded-science-legit-science/>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0110329>

Private organizations that direct crowd funding activities specifically related to research include:

Benefunder: <http://benefunder.org/>  
 SciFund Challenge: <https://scifundchallenge.org/>  
 Experiment.com: <https://experiment.com/>  
 Funded Science: <http://fundedscience.com/>

As an example, the SciFund Challenge website lists their stated goal as: “SciFund Challenge is a nonprofit that empowers scientists to shrink the gap between science and society. We train scientists how to connect to the public, back scientists in their outreach, and crowdfund to support research. The goal? A more science engaged world.”

Crowd funding efforts can require substantial time, money and resources. Most of these organizations, mostly for-profit companies, charge fees up front for their services.

Additionally, crowd funding of a range of activities including research is currently being explored by a number of universities in a number of ways. Research-related resources found included:

Crowd Funding Specifically for Higher Education: <http://useed.org/>  
 Univ. Virginia: <https://uva.useed.net/archive>  
 Arizona State Univ. “PitchFunder”: <https://asu.useed.net/>  
 Georgia Tech “TechStarter”: <http://www.news.gatech.edu/2013/11/11/tech-starter-offers-new-funding-solution>

In particular, the UT Office of Development has started its own crowd funding service:

“HornRaiser”: <https://hornraiser.utexas.edu/>  
 UT HornRaiser has already raised money to support several research projects by faculty and students.

As UT Austin currently has no policies regarding the use of crowd funding for supporting research, it is important that policies and procedures to ensure adequate protections for the faculty and/or students who may use these resources, for the University, and potentially also for those donating to such efforts.

**Specific Policy Issues and/or Questions that Need to Be Addressed:**

Crowd Funding is a new and potentially viable mechanism for funding science that may greatly benefit the University. However, it is not clear if, or to what extent current crowd funding efforts meet common research integrity standards in place for other forms of research funding, such as grants (federal, private foundation, etc.), industry moneys etc. The RPC recommends that the University administration, in close consultation with the Office of the Vice President for Research consider developing policies that address the following specific real and/or potential concerns that crowd funding of research activities raises:

With regard to crowd-funded research conducted through the University Development Office (i.e., “HornRaiser”):

- The University Development Office should develop ways to clarify and distinguish in their application process which crowd-funded projects will specifically constitute “research” activities from other projects that would not constitute “research”
- HornRaiser and/or the University Development Office should develop and implement policies that ensure that those projects that are designated as “research” meet existing research standards that would otherwise apply to any faculty or student conducting research at UT Austin, including for example:
  - Human subjects and/or animal training requirements
  - Compliance with conflict of interest (COI) and conflict of commitment
  - Lab safety and applicable training
  - Any other applicable regulations already in place at UT Austin
- The University Development Office should coordinate closely with the Office of the Vice President for Research to develop and implement these policies.

With regard to crowd-funded research conducted through outside organizations:

- The University should develop guidelines to delineate when faculty and/or students and/or other members of the UT community can and cannot pursue outside crowd funding activities.
- The University should develop guidelines to delineate what types of crowd funding activities are and are not appropriate for faculty and/or for graduate and undergraduate students to pursue.
- The University should develop policies to ensure that any research conducted with crowd funded resources complies with all existing research-related guidelines, including human subjects (IRB), animal research (IACUC), lab safety, conflict of interest / commitment, etc.
- The University should develop policies to delineate guidelines for crowd funding of “research” activities from other types of potentially academically relevant activities (e.g., writing a book, art installation, etc.)
- The University should develop policies to specify if and how any funds raised through external crowd funding efforts are to be handled and processed through the University to ensure appropriate financial oversight, as consistent with other forms of funded research activities (grants, gifts, etc.)

In addition to these specific recommendations, the crowd funding issue raised a number of other questions that may need to be considered in regard to establishing University policies regarding crowd funding of research activities as conducted by faculty, students, or other employees of the University:

- Protecting Faculty and/or Students:
  - What can UT Austin do to ensure and/or reduce the likelihood of faculty and/or students being exposed to undue financial risk by engaging in crowd funding activities that may lose money?
- Protecting the University:
  - What can UT Austin do to ensure faculty and/or students or staff do not act un-ethically and/or do not use their University affiliation inappropriately when participating in outside crowd funding activities?
  - Can faculty crowd-fund “side projects” they do “on their own time” (i.e., outside of University time), similar to other outside consulting work? How would those efforts be handled / regulated?
- Protecting Donors:
  - What is the “contract” between researcher and donors? Who oversees this? What if people donate and the work is not done, or does not lead to the intended outcome, etc.?
  - What recourse options do donors have? Likely need to be very clear to donors up front what it is they are donating to and what they can and cannot expect in return.

These issues were raised and considered at some length. The University Development Office staff were very open and helpful in assisting with these discussions. We hope that bringing awareness of the need to address these issues to the Faculty Council and University administration leads to positive change.

Jonathan B. Dingwell, chair

### **C-12 Responsibilities, Rights and Welfare of Graduate Student Academic Employees Committee**

The Committee elected Professor Todd J. Arbogast to serve as chair elect.

The committee received a proposed draft of a Graduate Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities (GSBORR). It was presented by graduate student and Graduate Student Assembly representative Margaret Clark. After discussing the proposed GSBORR, and due to the fact that it attends to both academic and employment-related concerns, the committee asked that it be referred to the Graduate Assembly Administrative Committee, in hopes that it would be put on the agenda for consideration and endorsement by the Graduate Assembly. As this report is being written, that endorsement has been given and the Graduate Assembly will consider the GSBORR at its April 27 meeting. If the Graduate Assembly endorses the GSBORR, the C-12 Committee will refer it with its own endorsement to the Faculty Council, requesting its adoption at the Faculty Council’s May 2, 2016 meeting.

Allan H. Cole, chair

**C-13 Information Technology Committee**

**FUNCTION:** To recommend to the president, and to the chief information officer, and to the Faculty Council changes in policies regarding **information technology**; to consult with and advise the chief information officer about policies and procedures pertaining to information technology at the University (est. 2005 D 3694).

The committee met in September, October, November, December, February, March, and April. The topics considered are listed below. Joan Hughes served as chair, Dennis Passovoy served as vice chair, and the chair-elect is Dennis Passovoy, lecturer in the McCombs School of Business. The committee identified the following priorities for discussion:

1. learning management systems policy and resources for online learning;
2. cloud computing resources;
3. EID authentication policies for human resources;
4. teaching, and research;
5. transition processes for mainframe to cloud computing for human resources and finance;
6. Windows 10 updates;
7. data mining of faculty, staff, and students; and
8. online learning best practices.

In our meetings we discussed priorities #1-7.

The committee advised on: the Dell Medical School's infrastructure development, planning to use common good technologies, and connections with TACC.

The committee voted in support of the SITAB to have representation of the Vice President of Research. However, no formal policy change was requested this year.

The committee endorsed recommendations on bandwidth allocation.

The committee endorsed improvements to Canvas and made suggestions for clarifying processes for faculty input.

The committee was briefed on the following:

- research computing infrastructure, as leveraged through ITS, libraries, and TACC
- office 365 toolset, with overview of soon-to-be-released features: one drive, onenote, classnote, skype IM for business, yammer
- digital asset management systems, specifically regarding coordination getting islandora (drupal) installed, input from various users, and coordination with the libraries. The focus is for audio, video, and image collections (not research data).
- cyberinfrastructure, including a storage corral (5 terabytes per PI) that was re-funded by Regents. The corral is HIPAA, FERPA compliant.
- Cloud storage: google drive is another option over UTBox and is good for instructional purposes. 50 Gigs are provided per faculty member.

**September 14, 2015**

- Introductions
- Governance structure
- Meeting dates
- Co-chair: Dennis Passovoy
- Identifying priorities

**October 12, 2015**

- Introduction to IT-related governance (policy and committees) at UT
- IT governance priorities draft version (for review and input)
- Review dates of conflict for meetings
- Review agenda topics to clarify and/or extend

**November 9, 2015**

- Bandwidth Allocation - Recommendation (*William Green*)
- Canvas Improvements (*Mario Guerra*)

- Add VP Research to SITAB – Discussion

**December 7, 2015**

- Digital Asset Management System – Update (Aaron Chaote)
- UT System Research Cyberinfrastructure – Discussion (Preston Broadfoot)
- UT Cloud Storage Solutions – Brief (Brad Englert)

**February 8, 2016**

- Researching at TACC (Bill Barth)
- Classroom Response Systems (Noah Stroehle, Ken Tothoro)
- The Network and Classroom Response Systems (William Green)
- Longhorn Innovation Fund for Technology (Christy Tran)

**March 4, 2016**

- Research IT Update (David Pavkovic)
- Office 365 Extended Tool Set (Trice Humpert)

**April 13, 2016**

- Learning Analytics / Big Data at the University
  - Phil Long, Learning Sciences
  - William Grant, Institutional Review Board

Joan Hughes, chair

**C-14 Technology-Enhanced Education Oversight Committee**

Executive Summary:

This annual report for the Technology-Enhanced Education Oversight Committee for the academic year 2015-16 provides an overview of the activities of the C-14 Committee concerning two major issues: 1) the frequent use of a specific set of instructional technologies (polling technologies, e.g., iClicker) in UT Austin classrooms and how they can be reconciled with current University policies about security and fees, and 2) the ownership and licensing rights of educational content by UT Austin faculty within current UT System regulations. The C-14 Committee has made recommendations on both issues, the latter of which has generated new tasks for the C-14 Committee in the 2016-17 academic year.

Submitted by: Robert Crosnoe (Chair) and Jennifer Moon (Co-Chair)

Robert Crosnoe, chair