

DOCUMENTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES
OF THE GENERAL FACULTY FOR 2012-2013

The annual reports of the standing committees of the General Faculty for 2012-13 received to date are reproduced below.



Sue Alexander Greninger, Secretary
General Faculty and Faculty Council

A. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEES

A-1 Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Faculty members are engaged in fostering critical thinking, and 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 2012-13, the work of CCAFR can be divided into three separate subjects, and each subject is described in a separate section in this document:

1. revision of University guidelines for faculty annual evaluations and comprehensive post-tenure review,
2. six investigations of claims of procedural irregularities in tenure and promotion cases, and
3. investigation of a claim of procedural irregularities in a comprehensive post-tenure review.

Comprehensive post-tenure review occurs after every six years in a tenured position with some exceptions [1]. The three sections are next, followed by a section on open issues.

1. Revision of University Guidelines for Faculty Annual Evaluations and Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review

For annual evaluations and comprehensive post-tenure reviews, CCAFR remains an important appeal avenue for faculty members alleging violations of University procedures (below) and/or academic freedom principles. Academic freedom in teaching, research, and service is defined by the American Association of University Professors (<http://www.aaup.org>), among other sources, as mentioned in Appendix B. CCAFR does not review disputes about professional judgments concerning the merits of a faculty member's record. [1]

Here is a summary of what has changed for annual evaluations and comprehensive post-tenure reviews of teaching, scholarship, and service for the 2012-13 academic year: [1][2]

1. UT System and UT Austin are now enforcing their long-standing requirement of written annual evaluations for each tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty member. [3]
2. Two consecutive overall (aggregate) ratings of “unsatisfactory” on annual evaluations may lead to disciplinary action (e.g. for dismissal) or further review (e.g. comprehensive post-tenure review).
3. Overall (aggregate) ratings are reported to UT System and will likely be made public.
4. The budget council, extended budget council, or executive committee in the faculty member’s home department (or school/college for schools/colleges without departments) oversees both the annual evaluation and the comprehensive post-tenure review:
 - a. the department chair and/or dean may write a dissenting letter to the findings of the budget council, extended budget council or executive committee, to be included as part of the record;
 - b. the dean or faculty member may request additional review at the college level in the case of an unsatisfactory comprehensive post-tenure review;
 - c. in the case of a dissenting letter by the department chair and/or dean, the final rating category for annual review is determined by the department chair or dean of a non-departmentalized college/school; and the final rating for comprehensive post-tenure review is determined by the budget council, extended budget council or executive committee.
5. For both annual evaluations and comprehensive post-tenure reviews, a faculty member must receive from the budget council, extended budget council or executive committee a written evaluation of teaching, research, and service, and an overall (aggregate) rating as described next.
6. One of the following four categories must be assigned to reflect the overall (aggregate) rating: [2][4]
 - a. exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, discipline or unit
 - b. meets expectations: normally expected level of accomplishment
 - c. does not meet expectations: a failure beyond what can be considered in the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance but of a character that appears to be subject to correction
 - d. unsatisfactory: failing to meet expectations in a way that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or involves *prima facie* professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence
7. “If the overall [comprehensive post-tenure review] evaluation is unsatisfactory, the written report shall contain sufficient documentation to identify the area(s) of unsatisfactory performance and the basis for the committee’s decision.” [1]
8. “UT Austin is recognized for the outstanding quality of its faculty; therefore it is expected that the vast majority of faculty will be found to meet or exceed expectations as a result of comprehensive review.” [1]
9. A faculty member receiving an “unsatisfactory” comprehensive post-tenure review may request an additional intensive review by the college or school by February 28 and the additional intensive review (if requested) must be completed by May 31. [1]
10. A tenured faculty member undergoing comprehensive post-tenure review is not required to undergo an annual evaluation in the same academic year. [4]
11. Annual evaluation or comprehensive post-tenure review may serve as a basis for merit raises.
12. Comprehensive post-tenure review may form a basis for determining honors and awards. [1]

Since comprehensive post-tenure review was implemented in 1999-2000, fewer than 3 percent of tenured faculty at UT Austin received an “unsatisfactory” comprehensive post-tenure review.

An “unsatisfactory” rating on an annual evaluation or comprehensive post-tenure review has significant consequences for the faculty member. A rating of “unsatisfactory” must be adequately justified in writing in the evaluation. [1-4] CCAFR is a resource available to those who alleged that University procedures and policies were not followed in annual evaluations or comprehensive post-tenure reviews. Appendix A gives information on how to file a claim with CCAFR of alleged violations of University procedures and/or academic freedom principles.

The faculty ombuds is available as a neutral third party to discuss concerns about annual evaluations and comprehensive post-tenure reviews <http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/ombuds/>.

The CCAFR chair is also available for informal discussions of alleged violations of procedures and

academic freedom principles.

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

In January 2013, six faculty members claimed procedural violations concerning tenure and promotion cases. One of them also alleged a violation of academic freedom.

Assistant professors A and B had been informed of denial of tenure and promotion in December 2011, and that denial was upheld in spring 2012. Assistant professors A and B requested and received approval for reconsideration of their tenure and promotion cases for the 2012-13 academic year from their respective departmental budget councils (or executive committees). Assistant professors A and B were informed of denial of tenure and promotion in December 2012. Both filed CCAFR appeals during the first week of February in 2013.

Assistant professors A and B claimed procedures for reconsideration of tenure and promotion denial in the General Guidelines were not very detailed, especially on the following questions:

1. How are “new materials” evaluated?
2. How are materials from former cases evaluated?
3. How are external reviewers selected?
4. Who defines the scholar’s fields of study in how importance of scholarship is evaluated?
5. What is the role of external reviewers in internal evaluations of research and scholarship?
6. How do budget council evaluators conduct their review, including standards used?

The CCAFR subcommittees for assistant professors A and B did not find evidence of the procedural errors mentioned in faculty appeals primarily because the University’s tenure and promotion reconsideration guidelines are insufficiently clear and detailed. CCAFR plans to address this deficiency in the guidelines by proposing a set of regulations for reconsideration cases to the Provost’s Office. President Powers concurred with the findings.

Assistant professor C alleged that he/she was not given the opportunity to give feedback on potential external reviewers selected by the department, that the external reviewer comments were utilized selectively, and that the dean’s letter inappropriately emphasized the candidate’s record of external funding over other criteria of research productivity and teaching effectiveness. The CCAFR subcommittee found that the candidate had the opportunity to give feedback on the potential external reviewers, external reviewer comments were accurately quoted, the candidate’s third-year review appropriately notes the problem with external funding, and the evaluation of external funding is a matter of professional judgment. The CCAFR subcommittee did not find any evidence of violations of University procedures or academic freedom principles. President Powers concurred with the findings.

Assistant professor D claimed that one of his/her graduate degrees was omitted in the evaluation, that members of the tenure and promotion committee discouraged him/her from reviewing the file, and that he/she did not know that the dean would be writing a statement as part of the tenure and promotion process. CCAFR found substantial procedural violations in the handling of the case, especially with the second issue of the candidate being denied access to the file. CCAFR recommended that assistant professor D be given reconsideration of tenure and promotion. President Powers concurred with the findings.

During the investigation of the appeal by assistant professor D, the CCAFR subcommittee found that the tenure and promotion guidelines for that school/college had not been updated since fall 1996. For example, that school/college required all assistant professors to apply for tenure and promotion after completing four years of the tenure probationary period instead of five years as per University guidelines. As another example, the school/college keeps the identities of the external reviewers from the candidate. In its report, the CCAFR subcommittee recommended that the college/school bring its promotion and tenure practices in line with those of the University. President Powers concurred with those findings as well.

Assistant professor E, who conducts research in ethnic studies, made the following claims:

1. Candidate did not receive any faculty evaluations other than the third-year review.
2. Candidate was not given the opportunity to review the list of potential external reviewers.
3. Candidate's ethnic studies research area is disfavored and disregarded in the department.
4. Budget council (or executive committee) evaluated research as being conducted over seven years instead of five years.
5. Letter from director of an ethnic studies center in which the candidate participates was not included in a timely manner.
6. College tenure and promotion committee member said "Why should we care about studying" the ethnic studies area of the candidate.
7. Candidate published in the top journals in the ethnic studies field, but the case was viewed negatively in part because the journals had not yet reached top-tier status ("Catch-22").

The CCAFR subcommittee found evidence contrary to claim #3, and could neither confirm nor disprove claim #4. The CCAFR subcommittee confirmed substantial procedural violations in #1, #2, #5, and #7 and found an academic freedom violation in #6. CCAFR was reluctant to recommend *de novo* reconsideration in which all new external reviewers are sought because the candidate's field is so narrow. With the exception of claim #7, President Powers concurred with the CCAFR findings and recommended that assistant professor E be reconsidered for tenure and promotion through the usual departmental process so that external reviewers could be the same.

Assistant professor F was hired at UT Austin to build a research program primarily based on running laboratory-intensive experiments. However, the candidate was not allocated lab space until the beginning of his second year. Moreover, during the first year, the candidate did not have access to temporary space for ordering and storing equipment. The primary charges follow:

1. The candidate experienced one year of delay in getting access to lab space, which delayed the overall research progress by a year.
2. Third-year review happened at the end of the fourth year and rated the candidate as very good in teaching, satisfactory in research, and very good in service.
3. In the fifth year, the candidate asked the department chair about extending the tenure probationary period, and the department chair said that the candidate's research progress is satisfactory and dissuaded the candidate from formally requesting an extension.

The CCAFR subcommittee confirmed primary charges #1 and #2, but did not find enough evidence to confirm or disprove primary charge #3. For primary charge #3, there are no current University policies that would have allowed an extension of the tenure probationary period. For primary charge #2, the third-year review came too late for assistant professor F to make significant adjustments for the tenure and promotion package that was assembled one year later.

A secondary charge was that the candidate did not get to see the name of at least one potential external reviewer before the review was solicited and that the external reviewers from any of the institutions from which the candidate received a graduate degree or served as a post-doctoral researcher were excluded. The CCAFR subcommittee confirmed the secondary charges.

The CCAFR committee confirmed several alleged procedural violations and recommended that assistant professor F be reconsidered for tenure and promotion. President Powers asked the CCAFR subcommittee to conduct a follow-up inquiry, which they did. In the July 9 response to both reports, President Powers writes: "On the whole, I conclude that while some issues are acknowledged by the CCAFR subcommittee, they are not sufficient to warrant a reconsideration of the case." President Powers also asked the provost to consider "expanding the existing probationary period extension policy to include cases in which a candidate is unable to pursue his or her laboratory research program due to capital project delays caused by UT Austin".

In December 2012, four associate professors and one senior lecturer were denied promotion. In addition, 15 assistant professors were denied tenure and promotion, which gives a tenure rate in 2012-13 of about 80 percent. Based on the claims of violations of University procedures and/or academic freedom principles in

the six appeals of tenure denial, CCAFR recommended that two faculty members be given reconsideration (assistant professors D and F) and four not be given reconsideration. President Powers changed the CCAFR recommendations on assistant professors E and F, which meant that two faculty members were given reconsideration and four were not given reconsideration. Even with the decision of tenure reconsideration, assistant professor E decided to accept a tenured position at another university.

3. Claim of Procedural Irregularities in a Comprehensive Post-Tenure Review

In June 2013, associate professor X filed an appeal with CCAFR concerning an unsatisfactory rating for a comprehensive post-tenure review. The appeal alleges several significant procedural violations. The CCAFR investigation is on-going at the writing of this report.

4. Open Issues

CCAFR continues to recommend changes in tenure and promotion processes, as well as annual evaluation and post-tenure review processes, to the president and provost. Both have been very receptive to these recommendations. CCAFR is an integral part of all of these processes.

Here is a partial list of open issues that CCAFR has identified during the last two years in investigating appeals from faculty members who have been denied promotion:

1. 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 T&P committee give input on a case, and how the dean is involved in college/school T&P committee meetings and other processes.
2. 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, peer-reviewed book chapters, and peer-reviewed articles.
3. 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.
4. There is a lack of detail and clarity in the tenure and promotion reconsideration guidelines for faculty members seeking redress of a negative tenure and promotion decision, including whether a department should use the same external reviewers, a new set of external reviewers, or some combination of the two in the reconsideration process.
5. There is a potential to consider extensions of the tenure probationary period for reasons other than personal circumstances, including the case in which a candidate is unable to pursue his or her laboratory research program due to capital project delays caused by UT Austin.

CCAFR is also gravely concerned about the proposed UT System Policy 180 on conflict of interest, conflict of commitment, and outside activities, including its disregard of academic freedom principles. A summary of the issues is available online. [6][7]

References

- [1] UT Austin procedures for comprehensive (six-year) post-tenure reviews, fall 2012.
http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/post_tenure/12-13_Guidelines_Comprehensive_Review.pdf
- [2] Board of Regents policies of annual and comprehensive review of tenured faculty members
<http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules/30000Series/31102.pdf>
- [3] Former UT Austin policy on “Annual Review and Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty”. Nov. 13, 1997.
<http://www.policies.utexas.edu/policies/annual-review-and-periodic-evaluation-tenured-faculty>
- [4] UT Austin guidelines procedures for faculty annual reviews, fall 2012.
http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/annual_review/2012-13%20Guidelines.Annual%20Review1.2.pdf

[5] UT Austin general guidelines for tenure and promotion, fall 2013.
<http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/TTT+NTT.Guidelines.Fall2013.final.pdf>

[6] Comments on UTS 180 [UT System Policy 180], May 28, 2013.
<http://users.ece.utexas.edu/~bevans/CommentsOnUTS180.html>

[7] UT Austin Faculty Council Web site, May 31, 2013.
<http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/>

Brian Evans, chair

A-2 Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets

The Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets (FACB) met a total of four times in the 2012-13 long session, three times in fall 2012 (once with the president and provost) and once in spring 2013 (with the president and provost). The committee sees its role as providing faculty input to the president and provost on budgetary matters and to offer faculty perceptions and concerns without filtering them through the administration. President Powers agrees that meetings with the FACB are helpful.

At its first meeting, the committee decided to keep working on these activities from the previous year:

1. Merit raises
2. Non-salary support for faculty

Issues to do with graduate-student support are addressed in a report by the joint committee with the Graduate Assembly headed by Alan Friedman and Shernaz Garcia. We hope the joint committee continues its work of monitoring support for graduate students.

As the year progressed, the Committee's discussions centered on members' sense of the growing demoralization felt by faculty because of flat salaries for most for some time now and because of having no participation in decision-making about how budget cuts will be felt and by whom. These and other issues were discussed in meetings both with and without the President and Provost.

Lack of Faculty Input on Budget Decisions

On this point, the committee drafted a position and a question for the president and provost:

- Budget decisions, which are increasingly made at the college/school level, have little or no faculty input. To the extent that faculty input is not solicited and used, budgetary decisions hardly correspond to the concerns and needs of our faculty. As chief executors of the primary functions of the University—education and research—the faculty should participate in identifying needs that require budgetary allocations. The FACB strongly recommends that faculty be included in a substantive way in budgetary decisions at the college and school level because we believe that such involvement is the only way for faculty to have any meaningful input and that such inclusion is fundamental to the concept of shared governance. *How can the President and the Provost empower the faculty to assist the Deans in budgetary decisions?*

The president and provost responded thusly:

On the academic side budgets are mostly delegated to deans. The president's philosophy is you should not give the units responsibility without authority, but he agrees that faculty input is important at the dean's level. The provost suggested that the committees involved in annual faculty evaluations may be in a position to provide input to the deans before and as they go through the "DPAC process" during the summer.

The reality is that most deans will say they agree faculty input is important, but it takes a lot of time and it can "fall off the table." Both Bill and Steve offered to "remind" the deans at Deans' Council meetings to get faculty input on their budget priorities. There is also the possibility of the FACB chair or the chair of Faculty Council addressing the Deans' Council on this issue.

Faculty Morale: Bonuses vs. Raises and Inflation

In the past few years, given the painful budget cuts, some faculty members have received one-time bonuses instead of permanent raises. Some committee members feel that bonuses are far inferior to permanent raises and actually do more harm than good. According to the president, last year there was a lot of debate about bonuses, and decisions about whether to give bonuses were left to the deans. His opinion is that bonuses are more appropriate for staff (especially lower-level staff who need money in their pockets) than for faculty, but some deans may think otherwise.

Additionally, as one committee member said, even for faculty who do get raises, “it hurts morale for them to know they came at the cost of someone (a staff member) losing their job.” The president believes, however, that if these laudatory responses became policy it would “deteriorate the University” over time. Budgets must give priority to faculty.

Regarding the effects of inflation: though the University has maintained individual faculty salaries stable during the recession, without individual pay cuts, inflation has effectively decreased most faculty salaries. In fact, the rising cost of living has diminished salaries. The president acknowledges this loss of purchasing power and called it a “terrible situation.” It is, however, an inevitable result of the aggregate budget being flat. Solving the problem depends on state politics. Most of the state's budget is mandated, only transportation and education are discretionary, and UT is at the mercy of the legislative budgetary decisions each biennium.

Committee Priorities Going Forward

By early March, it became a strong possibility that UT Austin would get back 50-60% of the \$46 million cut in the last biennium. Thus, for our final meeting of the year, the president asked: “If there is some money available during this upcoming budget year to do something more than cover the basics, what priority would faculty have in your particular unit—what would benefit faculty the most in your unit?”

These are the committee’s priorities:

1. Support for graduate students, including fellowships to cover the tuition gap
2. Support for faculty
 - Merit raises (instead of abundantly rewarding faculty who get outside offers)
 - The problems of salary inversion and compression (“loyalty tax”) urgently need attention
 - Summer fellowships for junior faculty (especially those who have received no merit raise since coming to UT Austin)
 - FRAs for all levels of faculty need more available money
 - Professional development support for all faculty (including lecturers)
 - Presidential research awards (even small amounts would help). Such awards should strike a reasonable balance between achievement and productivity on the one hand, and proposed future research on the other.

The President responded positively to these suggestions but noted that the one-time salary increases (bonuses) awarded in past couple of years were supposed to be similar to “presidential awards.” Additionally, there is no way the University could sustain a 2% raise over 4-5 years.

In conclusion, next year’s committee should keep in mind the president’s suggestion that the committee keep asking the deans to make sure there is faculty input on the budgeting process and the awards process (and also keep reminding the president and provost to raise the issue at the Deans’ Council meetings. The new chair of the FACB should also ask the president about visiting a Deans’ Council meeting.

And finally, the committee should take up the president’s suggestion to meet with Dan Slesnick, senior vice provost for resource management, to go through the institutional budget at the beginning of fall.

Hillary Hart, chair

A-3 Faculty Committee on Committees

1. Considered and approved Proposal D 8664 (Proposed Changes from the Committee on Committees to

Increase the General Faculty Standing Committee Terms of Service to Three Years). Helped in the revision of the composition of each of the standing committees to reflect three-year terms of service rather than two-year terms for faculty members. In doing so, we also took the opportunity to clean up the language making each committee composition more consistent and clear.

2. Approved changes in composition to the C-13 (Information Technology) committee. The number of representatives on this committee was increased to 15 for improved, University-wide representation. Their terms of service were staggered for continued representation on the committee as other members rotated off.
3. Over two meetings in April 2013, the committee reviewed the many nominations by faculty for committee membership. With attention to representation from all colleges and schools and issues of gender and racial diversity, the committee identified faculty members to recommend to the president to be new committee members on the twenty-one standing committees.
4. Seema Agarwala was selected as chair elect for 2013-14.

The committee wishes to thank Ms. Debbie Roberts and Ms. Anita Ahmadi for their help in organizing meetings, and for providing information on University regulations, by-laws etc. We could not have functioned without them.

Seema Agarwala, chair

A-4 Faculty Grievance Committee

The Faculty Grievance Committee had an active year.

One grievance involved a case in which tenure had been denied. The allegation of the grievant was that some bias had been introduced in the case because of a prior family leave, resulting in a longer than usual (calendar) time for the department to consider the person for tenure. The contention of the grievant was that external reviewers should have been explicitly told that the tenure “clock” was normal. The case had been appealed to the president; the president had denied tenure, but accepted the petition of the grievant that it should be considered by a grievance panel. Such a panel was constituted and a hearing was held; the panel ruled against the grievant and so the tenure case could not be re-opened.

A second grievance was filed with the committee by a faculty member alleging misconduct and prejudicial treatment of the grievant’s department chair. In accordance with the grievance procedures, a three member subcommittee of the Faculty Grievance Committee considered all of the material presented by the faculty member. The subcommittee’s decision was that there was insufficient evidence for a grievance, and the request for a hearing panel of peers was denied.

A third grievance was filed, but subsequently withdrawn prior to any action by the Faculty Grievance Committee. A few other inquiries about possible grievances were also made to the committee chair, but did not result in any formal grievance being filed at the time of this writing.

The committee chair, Desmond Lawler, was on leave in the spring semester and so much of the actions of the committee were handled by the vice chair, Sharon Strover.

Desmond Lawler, chair

A-5 Faculty Welfare Committee

The committee met on September 19, October 17, November 2, December 6, January 16, March 21, and April 22.

The September meeting was attended by Gayle Acton who was elected vice chair, Dena Granof, Beverly Hadaway, Blinda McClelland, Rachael Rawlins, Megan Seaholm, Leslie Vaaler, Jo Worthy, and Elizabeth Youngdale. The October meeting was attended by Gayle Acton, Blinda McClelland, Megan Seaholm, Leslie Vaaler, and Jo Worthy. The November meeting was attended by Dena Granof, Rachael Rawlins, Elizabeth Youngdale, and Leslie Vaaler. The December meeting was attended by Dena Granof, Blinda McClelland, Rachael Rawlins, Megan Seaholm, Leslie Vaaler, and David Warner (newly appointed). The January meeting was attended by Dena Granof, Fernanda Leite, Jo Worthy, Leslie Vaaler, and David Warner (for part of the meeting only). The March meeting was attended by Dena Granof, Fernanda Leite,

Blinda McClelland, Leslie Vaaler, David Warner, and Jo Worthy as well as guests Kelly Lomasney and Claire Moore. The April meeting was attended by Gayle Acton, Blinda McClelland, Rachael Rawlins, Megan Seaholm, Leslie Vaaler, and David Warner (briefly).

With the exception of the March meeting, the primary topic of discussion concerned non-tenure-track faculty. It was the hope of the committee that its work would result in Faculty Council legislation during the 2012-13 academic year. And while a proposal was brought to the FCEC for possible consideration at its April 19 meeting, bringing a proposal concerning non-tenure-track faculty before the Faculty Council was delayed until the 2013-14 calendar year.

The proposal that was brought first to Provost Leslie and Vice Provost Ritter and then to the FCEC was an edit of the report of the President's Ad Hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Track Teaching Faculty (D 2488-2493 of the General Faculty) and also drew heavily on the 2005 Implementation Committee report chaired by Hillary Hart (D 4277-4281). Edits were made to make provisions mandatory rather than just recommendations, and important new provisions were added.

The 2012-13 committee's recommendations included the following:

1. There should be mandatory consideration for promotion of lecturers and senior lecturers after six years in rank, so long as their employment qualifies as benefits-eligible.
2. Promotion in rank must be accompanied by an increase in salary as is now true for tenure-track and tenured faculty. Moreover, the dollar scale for promotion-associated raises of non-tenure-track faculty should be made known to deans, department chairs, and non-tenure track faculty.
3. Senior lecturers and distinguished senior lecturers should be given rolling three-year contracts.
4. Copies of the latest policies concerning non-tenure-track faculty should be distributed to all deans and department chairs and to non-tenure-track faculty at least annually. They should be given to newly hired non-tenure-track faculty.

At the March meeting, the committee met with Wellness Coordinator Kelly Lomasney and Work-life Balance and Wellness Manager Claire Moore who helped the committee get an overview of health benefits and understand the Work-Life program. It was generally agreed that this was informative and that it would be good for the committee to meet with human resources representatives on an annual basis to ensure that the committee is aware of any changes or anticipated changes. Meeting with representatives familiar with retirement options is also recommended.

The April meeting included discussion as to whether there should be a possibility of emeritus status for non-tenure-track faculty with long-term service. It was suggested that this might be consider as part of a general evaluation of benefits for retired faculty. It was noted that there have been many changes in technology since there was last Faculty Council legislation pertaining to this issue and that there would likely be some desirable changes due to that fact.

Leslie J. Vaaler, chair

A-6 General Faculty Rules and Governance Committee

The Faculty Rules and Governance Committee (FR&G) conducted most of its business via e-mail during 2012-13 and also met on Dec. 10, 2012. Legislation relating to voting rights (D 8512-8513 and D 8563) was passed by the Faculty Council in previous academic years, but still remains pending in the Office of the President. Given the likelihood that voting rights legislation will require further revision and reconsideration by the Faculty Council, a summary of issues was presented to the Faculty Council at the regular meeting of January 28, 2013 (<http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2012-2013/minutes/min012813/VII.A.html>). No change in the core principles that served as the basis of the original voting rights proposal was suggested.

At the Dec. 10, 2012, meeting the Faculty Rules and Governance Committee also discussed issues related to the privileges of emeritus faculty, as outlined in *HOP* 3.01/ now 2-2430 "Emeritus Titles; Perquisites and Privileges of Emeritus Faculty, Emeritus Administrative Officials and Other Retired Faculty." In particular, it was the opinion of the Faculty Rules and Governance Committee that the *HOP* statement that

holders of emeritus titles continue to hold membership “without vote” in the General Faculty and in the college and department faculties does not automatically preclude emeritus faculty from serving on PhD committees. A subsequent meeting with Graduate School administration to further discuss these issues took place on March 6, 2013.

In spring 2013, the committee elected Martha Hilley as chair elect and to serve as chair during academic year 2013-14.

Dean Neikirk, 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 regularly during the two long semesters in 2012-13 (the committee will probably meet two times during the summer of 2013). 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. Committee members ask questions of the editor, and there is a general discussion as appropriate for the project. The committee then votes. Although it is rare for a proposal to be rejected at this point in the process as those proposals recommended to the committee have undergone extensive review by in-house editors and outside reviewers, committee members can and do make recommendations for additional revisions and/or stipulated conditions for approval. As a general rule, the members of the committee are conscientious and carefully review the materials prior to meetings. There is a good working relationship with the UT Press staff. The committee has no legislation to propose to the Faculty Council.

During the academic year of 2012-13, the UT Press published over 100 book titles as well as 11 journals. The press received over 30 awards during this time period. Accolades accorded the UT Press this academic year include, but are not limited to:

- 2013 NACCS Book Award, sponsored by the National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies.
 - Martha Menchaca. *Naturalizing Mexican Immigrants: A Texas History*.
- Choice Magazine’s Outstanding Academic Title List:
 - Camp, Roderic A. *Mexican Political Biographies, 1935-2009*.
 - Cohen, Jeffrey H. *Cultures of Migration: The Global Nature of Contemporary Mobility*.
 - Gucci, Guillermo. *The Cultural Life of the Automobile: Roads to Modernity*.
 - Kanellos, Nicolás. *Hispanic Immigrant Literature : El Sueño del Retorno*.
 - Tate, Carolyn E. *Reconsidering Olmec Visual Culture : The Unborn, Women, and Creation*.
 - Mehta, Monica. *Bombay Cinema*.
 - Talmon, Miriam. *Israeli Cinema*.
 - Jenkins, Tricia. *CIA in Hollywood*.
- 2013 Peter C. Rollins Book Award in Film/Television Studies, sponsored by the Southwest/Texas Popular Culture and American Culture Association.
 - Alisa Perren. *Indie Inc.*
- Texas State Historical Association:
 - 2012 Liz Carpenter Award for Research in the History of Women, and the
 - 2012 Coral Horton Tullis Memorial Prize.
 - Jan Reid (shared). *Let the People In*.

Blinda E. McClelland, chair

B. STUDENT SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES COMMITTEES

B-1 Committee on Financial Aid to Students

Student financial aid has faced significant challenges at The University of Texas at Austin in the last three years. During the 2012-13 academic year, the B-1 committee discussed several University financial aid initiatives and issues and provided corresponding input and feedback. Lizy John and Chang Liu served as co-chairs of the committee.

The Committee on Student Financial Aid met six times during the 2012-13 academic year on the following dates: September 10, October 19, November 16, February 25, March 18, and April 25. In an effort to address critical issues and provide possible solutions in the financial aids to students, the committee adopted a list of prioritized goals as follows:

Goals for Student Financial Aid:

1. Enhance the Bevonomics training program, such as increasing students' participation, recruiting more financial advisors, and providing more face-to-face consultation and training.
2. Improve and stabilize the timetable for applications for financial aid and notifications of financial aid to enable students (and parents) to plan more effectively.
3. Improve the process for informing students on termination of financial aid awards due to lack of academic progress.
4. Review and enhance the effectiveness of the dashboard that is used for student admission and financial aids to students.
5. Increase the number of campus jobs for students and build offers of campus employment into financial aid offers.
6. Develop a one-stop, central information portal for scholarships and other financial aid resources for students.
7. Make increased scholarship funds a top University priority in fund raising.
8. Increase student understanding of financial aid processes and procedures.
9. Find ways to make financial aid more effective in promoting four-year graduation rates.
10. Have a fixed tuition contract for a four-year degree.
11. Create more merit-based scholarships, even if these are small.
12. Better align goals and objectives of the Office of Student Financial Services with the goals of colleges and departments in their use of scholarship dollars.

These goals are identified as a starting point for further discussion and implementation. The present report comments only on the top four goals that are discussed extensively by the committee.

Attending college means more independence and responsibility for students, including the financial responsibility. The Bevonomics program provides a great opportunity for incoming freshmen and current students to understand and improve financial management and control in their college journey. The financial knowledge and training is certainly needed such that students can use their financial resources like financial aids in a wise and reasonable manner. Increasing students' participation, recruiting more financial advisors, and providing more face-to-face consultation and training appear to be reachable steps for the Bevonomics program improvement. Another suggestion is, to overcome the difficulty of being short of funding for the Bevonomics program, student organizations (e.g., those on financial management and investment) may be recruited to serve as financial advisors as community service.

College education becomes a major financial burden for students and their families. It is critical for students and parents to know the timetable of financial aid application and decisions such that they have enough lead time to plan the college education financially. The UT Office of Student Financial Service has been making best efforts to provide students thorough and accurate information of financial aids in a timely manner, especially in recent challenging years. The challenges are mainly due to the delayed timeline of the State legislation and other uncontrollable issues. It should be noted that this issue is broad across the campus. To address this issue more effectively, greater coordination and cooperation need to be conducted thorough UT multiple units including colleges, graduate school, and OSFS. The second goal addresses this issue.

The third goal focuses on the financial aids of students who have academic struggles in college. It is important to inform them in a timely manner with multiple ways (e.g., emails) and levels (e.g., Financial Aid office and their advisors) such that they can realize their problem and have lead time to find out potential solutions.

The fourth goal is concentrated on how to effectively use the dashboard to recruit high-quality students. A

number of factors, such as students' potential success at UT and the diversity at UT, are needed to consider for student admission which is tightly related with financial aids to students. Some concerns were expressed regarding the use of dashboard. Further discussion is needed on this topic.

Other activities of the committee include the following:

1. The committee received and discussed a report by Director of Student Financial Services, Dr. Thomas Melecki, on the general status and recent challenges of student financial aid at The University of Texas at Austin.
2. Upon the request from the Senate of College Council for the membership in the Financial Aid to Students (B1) committee, the committee discussed and agreed that the student members in the committee will be composed of two students from the Student Government and two students from the Senate of College Council, and one from the Graduate Student Association, starting from the academic year 2013-14.
3. Dr. Victor Saenz was elected as the Committee Chair for the academic year 2013-14.
4. The committee discussed the impact of the four-year graduation rate policies on financial aid and related issues. The success of the four-year graduation is a complicated issue, determined by several factors such as family income, financial aid, and students' academic performance including their high school and UT performance (like GPA, SAT scores). Several initiatives and policies were in discussion, e.g., \$1000 incentive and summer bridging program.
5. The committee discussed the dashboard that has been used for student admission and financial aid to students and agreed that more discussions are needed.
6. In April, the Ronald M. and Marilou D. Brown Endowed Scholarship was reviewed by a committee from the Financial Aid Office chaired by Joe Wilcox and the procedure and decision was reported to the committee. The scholarship stipend for each of the top 10 candidates was awarded at \$1,000.

Lizy D. John and Chang Liu, co-chairs

B-2 Recreational Sports Committee

September 5, 2012.

Introductions were made and the election for vice chair took place. Thomas Hunt nominated Glenn Peers who was unanimously elected.

Committee Overview

Tom Dison, *ex officio*, provided an overview of the Division of Recreational Sports (RecSports) and the role of the Recreational Sports Committee along with a sampling of divisional highlights from 2011-12. 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 2012-13. Packets of divisional publications and related materials were distributed, including a list of divisional highlights for 2011-12.

October 17, 2012—Recreational Sports' Financial Overview, Budget Review

The committee was given an overview of the concepts and philosophy upon which the Division of Recreational Sports approaches the use and expenditure of funds, along with an overview of how the budget process works relative to the Student Services Budget Committee (SSBC). RecSports has been experiencing budget reductions since 2003-4. Most recently, RecSports was required to find \$304,000 in reductions in 2010-11, \$248,000 in 2011-12, and \$40,000 in 2012-13 and expects to be required to find an additional \$120,000 in the next 3 fiscal years (2013-14 through 2015-16). Tom Dison explained that the division would be requesting an increase in support of a request from Student Government to increase facility operations by one hour at Gregory Gym, the Recreational Sports Center, and Caven Lacrosse and Sports Center at Clark Field.

November 30, 2012—Membership and Facility Usage Fees

The committee reviewed and supported the RecSports 2013-14 membership and facility use fee schedules and did not request an increase in membership fees for 2013-14. A flat 2.2 percent increase in the facility use fee was also proposed. The increase is intended to compensate for escalating maintenance and utility costs and is based on the average Consumer Price Index (CPI) over the past three years.

Assessment Initiatives

Dison reviewed the recent biennial survey of students. For over thirty years, the Division of Recreational Sports has consistently conducted research and collected data in an effort to identify trends, allocate resources, and determine future directions. The data RecSports collects includes usage and participation, satisfaction levels, benefits and outcomes, and demographics. The division typically schedules four to six assessment projects annually. In addition to campus-wide surveys, RecSports also collects feedback from individual participants in each major program area as well as from its large student workforce.

February 8, 2013—Election of 2013-14 Chair Elect

The Faculty Council requested that the committee elect a chair for the following fiscal year at this meeting. Committee chairs must be faculty members. Thomas Hunt nominated the current vice-chair, Glenn Peers. The motion was seconded. No other nominations were made. A vote was called and Peers was unanimously elected.

Whitaker Fields Update

Whitaker Fields, the mixed-use, outdoor recreational facility at 51st Street and Guadalupe, was last renovated in 1980-81, and in need of major infrastructural improvements. RecSports commissioned a feasibility study in 2007-8, and the project was added to the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) in 2009. RecSports commissioned two additional engineering studies in 2010 to ascertain the scope and cost of the project.

The proposed renovation project will have two facets. The first addressing maintenance and infrastructural needs including repairs to existing buildings and systems, new grading, drainage, irrigation, lighting and sod. The second facet of the project, if approved and funded, will address site enhancements such as synthetic fields, new maintenance support buildings, a shade pavilion, decorative fencing, signage, security, landscaping, and various other amenities that would greatly improve the usability of the complex.

The division is proposing a split-funding model, in which RecSports pays for infrastructural needs, and donor funding covers enhancements. The division is in the process of acquiring all the necessary approvals before communicating the plan.

May 1, 2013—Updates and Wrap-up

Miscellaneous Updates

Tom Dison provided various miscellaneous updates, including a list of recent and upcoming events, organizational changes, and projects in which RecSports is involved.

Gregory Indoor Track Accessibility

Relaying a blind student's concern, Jack Lee noted that the handrail on the Gregory Gym indoor track discontinues at the east end due to the placement of support columns, making it difficult for the student to navigate that section of the track. Dison explained that Gregory Gym was designed to be code compliant and this was the first complaint received regarding track accessibility. Now that the division is aware of the issue, it will work toward finding an effective resolution.

Committee Activities/Meeting Topics for 2013-14

- Introductions and committee overview
- Election of vice chair
- Review of divisional accomplishments from 2012-13 and goals for upcoming year
- Division of Recreational Sports' budget updates for 2014-15
- Membership and facility usage fees for 2014-15
- Updates and announcements
- Special topics as needed

Thomas M. Hunt, chair

B-3 Student Life and Activities Committee

After a good start, the Student Life and Activities Committee's (SLAC) activities tapered off in the latter part of the fall 2012 and especially the spring 2013 semester. This was partly because of scheduling difficulties—members of the committee were not available at mutually convenient times, and it turned out to be impossible to gather quorum—and partly because, as in 2011-12, the committee continued to struggle to determine the nature and feasibility of its charge.

The following were the most significant activities of SLAC as a whole, as well as of the chair of the committee and select members:

- Early in its deliberations, the committee reiterated the conclusion of the previous year's committee that a systematic approach to intercollegiate athletics is beyond the scope of the committee if its mandate is to be concerned more broadly with student life/activities on campus. The committee observed that the athletics council already serves an important role in this regard and urged Faculty Council to rethink this aspect of the committee's charge.
- Chair and willing members of the committee met with Michael Morton, president of the Senate of College Councils, and discussed proposed changes to the University Honor Code on Monday, November 5; those present at the meeting endorsed the draft of the proposed changes.
- Chair and willing members of the committee met twice with Randa Ryan, senior associate athletics director, during spring 2013 to determine what kind of fruitful relationship might be created between athletics student services and SLAC. It does seem that the systematic advising and mentoring approach taken on by athletics to ensure success for "academically at-risk" students could be very useful for other students on campus who have similar "risk factors" and thus perhaps even improve four-year graduation rates. Faculty Council might be helpful in advocating for such resources to be available more widely, but this would require financial investment. It was not clear to the SLAC leadership whether this kind of recommendation (and especially a study to back such a recommendation) was within the scope of SLAC.
- Early in its deliberations, the committee discussed how to gain a systematic understanding of student concerns for the committee to have a real role in addressing them. Two avenues of investigation were chosen, though neither was pursued effectively, because of the inability to reach a quorum:
 1. Make use of the Student Engagement at Research Universities (SERU) survey; Dr. Gale Stuart visited SLAC at its October meeting to present some of the ways that SERU data might be helpful to the committee's discussions. The goal to have SLAC brainstorm how SERU findings could help direct the committee's efforts was stymied by unsuccessful attempts to reach a quorum following the October meeting.
 2. Draw from the stated goals of student leadership (recently elected, as well as "losing parties" from the past couple of election cycles) likewise to determine student priorities and work with student groups to determine how faculty can help advance those priorities. Student members of SLAC provided some initial links to materials connected to stated student leadership goals; the intention for SLAC to discuss how faculty might support such goals was likewise thwarted by the inability to reach a quorum for subsequent meetings.
- Discussions of a subset of the committee with Randa Ryan made it clear that there have been a number of task forces and committees on undergraduate student life (including athletics) in the past, mostly convened by the President and the University administration rather than Faculty Council. Those committees have made recommendations, but it is currently unclear to SLAC which of those recommendations have been implemented and why others have been rejected.

Unless SLAC has a clearer sense of what has already been proposed and accomplished, it seems that we may be duplicating previous efforts.

The SLAC chair for 2013-14, Chandra Muller, has pledged to follow up with some of these issues in the coming year, also in conjunction with Martha Hilley, current chair of the Faculty Council and also chair elect of SLAC in 2013-14 (thus to be chair of SLAC in 2014-15) in the hopes of providing a charge to the committee that might revitalize its purpose and perhaps assist with bringing committee members together for meetings.

Andrew Dell'Antonio, chair

C. INSTITUTIONAL POLICY OR GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES

C-1 Admissions and Registration Committee

The Committee met in both the fall and spring semesters as well as corresponded via email throughout the year.

At the first meeting of the year, Kedra Ishop, Director of Admissions, presented the committee with an overview of the current admission criteria and processes, as well as a discussion of potential changes that could occur due to mandates by the State Legislature or a decision by the Supreme Court.

In October the Committee approved the following motion to change its composition:

Motion: Beginning fall 2013, the student representation on the Admissions and Registration committee would be the following: two representatives from the Senate of College Councils, two representatives from Student Government, and one representative from the Graduate Student Assembly.

Approval of this motion changed the composition of the committee from the existing arrangement of four students (3 student government representatives and 1 graduate student assembly representative) to five students, with 2 of them coming from the Senate of College Councils, an academically-oriented organization that previously was not formally represented on the Committee. Therefore the motion provided for all three Legislative Student Organizations (LSOs) to have a voice. After approval of the motion by our Committee, it was forwarded to the Committee on Committees of the Faculty Council and subsequently approved, and then approved by the Council itself. The motion was then approved by President Powers and Executive Vice Chancellor Reyes.

The Committee met in May to hear a presentation made by Augustine Garza, Deputy Director of Admissions. He provided the Committee with an update to admissions for fall 2013 and also discussed new programs from Vice Provost Laude's office. During this meeting, committee members indicated some interest in continuing to discuss expanding the ways in which UT recruits students from disadvantaged or under-served backgrounds. This is perhaps an issue the committee will address in fall of 2013.

Catherine Rieggle-Crumb, chair

C-2 University Academic Calendar Committee

Summary

In 2012-13, the University Academic Calendar Committee finalized and put forward to Faculty Council legislation for a two-day fall break to occur in the ninth week of the semester (mid-October). The legislation passed by a vote of 29-23 in the Faculty Council meeting of January 2013. Because the legislation was major legislation, it required a no-protest vote of the general faculty, which went out by email in February 2013. Had the general faculty lodged twenty-five or more protest votes, amounting to 1 percent or more of the general faculty, a meeting of the general faculty to vote on the issue would have been required. The Office of the Faculty Council received 59 votes, representing 2.5 percent of the general faculty, which led to a general faculty meeting in March 2013. At that meeting, the legislation failed by a vote of 58 against, 27 for.

Background

The fall break idea arose from an undergraduate student government resolution passed in February 2012, and a graduate student resolution passed in April 2012. The students favored a break that would provide them with an opportunity to rest mentally, physically, and emotionally in the middle of the fall semester, similar to the opportunity they have in the middle of the spring semester. They argued that the break would be particularly beneficial for freshmen adjusting to the workload and pace of college, and that a break might bolster freshman retention rates and decrease demand on student mental health counseling services.

Meeting in fall 2012, the committee began by considering what type of break to propose. Two options seemed most viable given the constraints of the academic calendar as spelled out in the *Principles for the Development of the Academic Calendar*, particularly the constraint of 70 days of instruction and the constraint on when the last day of the semester can occur. Those two options were a one-day break the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and a two-day break in mid-October. Only the latter would address the students' desires for a break in the middle of the semester; for this reason, the committee chose it, and specified the break for the Monday and Tuesday of the ninth week of the semester, which would typically be the third week of October, generally falling one or two weeks after the OU game.

Achieving a two-break in October meant pushing the start of the semester forward by two days to maintain 70 days of instruction, there being no readily attained slack at the end of the calendar. We knew from checking with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, which controls the Common Calendar, that starting two days earlier was fine; no waiver was needed. We knew from having checked with the Division of Housing and Food Service that the dorms would be available for students if we began the semester two days early. In short, we knew the break was feasible according to the two main constraints we could envision, but we were unsure about other possible constraints and what problems such a break might pose. From contacting 38 stakeholders in the spring of 2012, we knew the primary objections to a fall break in general, but we did not know the objections to a break with this specific timing.

To determine what problems might arise with a two-day break in the ninth week, the committee returned to the 38 stakeholders it had contacted in late spring 2012 to ask now about the advantages and disadvantages of a break in the ninth week. We received quite a bit of feedback, which we summarized and included in our legislative proposal. Please see Appendices A, B, and C, which contain the proposal and related materials that we submitted to the Faculty Council.

In December 2012, committee chair Diane Bailey presented the proposal to the Faculty Council and entertained questions. The discussion centered on the problems with labs in the natural sciences and engineering. Although the proposal provided a fall schedule with 12 whole weeks, the first whole week was also the first week of class, which instructors of lab courses deemed unsuitable for labs (TAs were not yet trained, students were likely to add in late and miss a lab). By their reasoning, the schedule provided only 11 usable whole weeks for labs, whereas the existing schedule provides 12 such weeks. In January 2013, Bailey again appeared before the Faculty Council, where the discussion continued, again with a focus on labs, until a vote was held. The vote was 29-23 in favor of the fall break proposal.

Upon learning that a General Faculty meeting would occur, the committee determined to gather more information to address some concerns that came up in the Faculty Council meetings. In particular, Faculty Council representatives had been keen to hear data from schools with fall breaks to learn if the breaks did in fact help with such matters as freshmen retention rates and mental health counseling services. We contacted 11 universities with fall breaks, but none had such data. As the table in Appendix D displays, these universities did, however, provide other useful information.

In presenting the passed legislation at the general faculty meeting, Bailey referred to some of the information collected from universities with fall breaks; she also discussed other information that our committee had gained from UT stakeholders. After a period of questions and answers, President Powers, who presided over the meeting, called for the vote, at which point Bailey called for a quorum. By Faculty Council rules, this quorum call came too late; the vote was held, with 58 votes against the measure and 27 for it.

The committee voted for Bailey to continue as chair for the 2013-14 academic year. In the wake of the

General Faculty meeting and an ensuing discussion with the chair of the Faculty Council and the Faculty Council Executive Committee about the rules governing general faculty meetings and the timing of quorum calls, Bailey resigned from this committee. We end the year with no chair.

Diane Bailey, chair

C-4 Educational Policy Committee

The EPC had a very productive and successful year. We begin by outlining our accomplishments, all of which have appeared in our monthly minutes; the report closes with a description of issues likely to emerge next year.

*Approving core curriculum language. At the request of Acting Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Larry Abraham, EPC scheduled its first meeting in late August/early September and we were able to have a full meeting on Business on September 12, ahead of the typical first “gathering” that occurs in the first Faculty Council meeting. Larry was working intensively on meeting new THECB mandates regarding our core curriculum, and needed to meet deadlines. At that meeting, we were briefed on changes to the core that would go into the catalog. After hearing suggestions and questions from EPC, Larry modified the core document; we approved this document at the October meeting. Larry also invited member Stephen White to work on a subcommittee undertaking more general revisions of the descriptions of the core areas so that the catalog would have a more consistent/coherent structure.

*Course evaluations. At the October meeting, student members, Michael Morton and Josh Fjelstul, produced a report asking that the Basic and Expanded Course Evaluations be changed to add items that inquire about how relevant course materials were to the course. They also proposed making slight changes to other items. We tabled the issue to await other information on the proposed changes. During the year, EPC learned that UT System is also working on proposed changes to course evaluations (which we should await before making any new changes); in addition, Dawn Zimmaro of CTL provided information on the estimated cost of making changes to all forms. The largest cost in labor associated with reprogramming forms. The estimated cost of a revision was just under \$60,000. With this information, the students withdrew the proposal at the March meeting.

*Consistency in International Studies. EPC entertained a proposal to change the academic characteristics of the so-called “Affiliated Studies” (AS) programs to make it consistent with the academic characteristics of “Study Abroad.” Under the change AS courses would count toward a student’s GPA and could count towards a major. We first heard it as a written proposal, but the Committee had several questions that could be answered only by having Heather Barclay Hamir, Director of Study Abroad, attend a meeting to answer questions. The rationale for this change is outlined in December 13 minutes. It was approved unanimously. Faculty Council then approved the change at its February meeting.

*Q-drop form altered. EPC unanimously passed a proposal to remove the requirement for faculty signatures on Q-drop forms submitted before the mid-semester deadline. The rationale for this appears in the November minutes. Faculty Council approved this change at its February meeting.

*Vice Provost Subcommittee Recommendations on Increasing Four-year Graduation Rates. Several EPC members (Bernstein, Stanfield, Ritter, Rose, Vickers) served on an ad hoc committee created by David Laude to go through the Task Force on Graduation Rates report and assess which policies could be implemented quickly and might have an impact on four-year graduation rates. EPC then entertained several proposals and passed them along to Faculty Council for approval. These include:

- Limiting the timing of internal transfers to different colleges, as well as the number of attempts (see discussion in February minutes). This passed unanimously and was approved by Faculty Council at its April meeting.
- Requiring that decisions to add a simultaneous major take into account a student’s ability to graduate within four years (see discussions in March and April minutes). This was approved unanimously at the April meeting and was approved by Faculty Council at its May 6 meeting.
- Dropping the “24-hour” rule that requires students seeking multiple degrees add 24 hours beyond the number demanded by the degree with the most units required. This was approved unanimously at the

May meeting and was approved by Faculty Council at its May 6 meeting.

*Creating a transcriptable minor. EPC initially considered a proposal for a transcript-recognized minor at its February meeting. Gretchen Ritter worked with students to develop a policy and presented this at the April and May meetings. After extensive discussion of workload issues (see May minutes) as well as the issue of not recognizing unnumbered courses (see April minutes), the proposal was approved by a vote of 6 – 2 at the May meeting. The policy was approved by Faculty Council at its May 6 meeting.

EPC concluded all of its business for the year. Thanks to Thomas Garza, who acted as Vice Chair of the committee. Mary Rose agreed to serve a single additional year as Chair, with approval from Martha Hilley and Hilary Hart. We expect that during the next year, we will discuss policy on the following areas:

*Online courses. Policy issues will arise as part of the move to offering on-line courses, including so-called “MOOC’s” (massively open online courses). EPC began a discussion of this topic at its November meeting (see minutes). Gretchen Ritter initiated this discussion, and her leadership in asking questions about these courses will be sorely missed as she moves on to Cornell to assume the Deanship of Arts & Sciences.

*System rules. UT System is developing requirements for changes to course evaluation forms and to the process of evaluating faculty teaching (e.g., how often to do so). Initial discussions are occurring and we expect that EPC will be entertaining particular policies in the 2013 – 2014 year.

*Possible “tweaking” policies we have previously approved. The discussion of the simultaneous majors policy raised many questions about how to design a policy that can be implemented effectively and fairly. In the simultaneous majors discussion, EPC members wanted to alter the proposal submitted from the policy implementation sub-committee to include an enforcement mechanism. The original policy mandated only that the decision to take on an additional major “take into account” the ability to graduate in four years. The policy did not lay out what happens when an additional major would increase graduation time. Committee members were concerned about the possibility of inconsistent enforcement across departments or colleges. In March we proposed adding language to give the policy more “teeth”: Deans would have to approve the additional major. However, we ran into a concern about majors that span two colleges and whether the Dean from the student’s “first” college (i.e., where they had their first major) could veto a decision to add a major from a “second college.” Over email, EPC discussed in detail the implications of this policy. It was further discussed at the April meeting, and EPC opted to remove the added language and return to the original proposed policy. We decided that if any implementation concerns arose, EPC could consider those problems one by one, rather than trying to anticipate them all. Shelby in particular argued that content policies are sometimes different than implementation policies, and in some instances a body may not be able to address all implementation issues while also deciding content. This will likely be a theme in other policy decisions; in addition, it is expected that some previously considered policies will come back to EPC for adjustments as the University observes how a policy works in practice.

*Committee size. EPC is a large body, having both voting and ex officio members. During the year, it was difficult to find a common meeting time that met all schedules, with the result that we lost out on input from valuable members. There is probably no fix for this; but it was a concern for the Chair in both the fall and spring terms.

The chair wishes to formally thank all members for their hard work and diligence this year. In addition, we are grateful to both the College of Liberal Arts and School of Undergraduate Studies for allowing us to use their meeting space.

Mary Rose, chair

C-5 Faculty Building Advisory Committee

Many ongoing construction projects on campus were completed during the 2012-13 academic year, and several new projects are still in the planning stages. Therefore, the Faculty Building Advisory Committee (FBAC) was less active than normal in 2012-13.

FBAC provided feedback on the 2012 Campus Master Plan, which was developed by Sasaki Associates

(<http://www.utexas.edu/operations/masterplan/>). The committee agreed that long-term planning is needed to guide the growth of the University and is pleased with the ideas described in the first phase of the master plan. The master plan also identified seven areas that should be included in future studies: (1) academic plan, (2) landscape plan, (3) East Campus plan, (4) student and residential life plan, (5) medical district plan, (6) athletics plan, and (7) city and state cooperation.

FBAC strongly supported the development of a landscape master plan and felt that implementation of such a plan would greatly enhance the overall pedestrian experience on campus. FBAC was eager to serve as the champion for such an effort. FBAC also strongly supported increased collaboration with the City of Austin.

FBAC continues to promote three priorities:

- FBAC remains focused on ensuring that new buildings are sustainable and efficient. Rather than simply seeking a target Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating for new construction; the committee's aim is to reduce the life-cycle costs.
- FBAC continues focus on increasing the inventory of general purpose classrooms across campus.
- FBAC also addresses accessibility issues on campus with a goal of ensuring that all new construction meets the needs of persons with disabilities.

These issues will remain priorities for 2013-14.

Sharon L. Wood, chair

C-6 International Programs and Studies Committee

Our committee considered three matters this academic year:

1. A proposal from Heather Barclay Hamir regarding the assignment of "Affiliated Studies Credit."
2. A proposal from Michael Morton of Student Government regarding the structure of student representation on the C-6 committee
3. An investigation of responsibility and liability of faculty members leading study abroad trips

I summarize our decisions and findings regarding these matters below.

Agenda Item #1: Proposal from Heather Barclay Hamir (Director, Study Abroad), regarding "Affiliated Studies Credit" (see Appendix A).

Summary: The committee considered the proposal (appended below) and voted unanimously in favor. The proposal was forwarded to Faculty Council for its approval.

Agenda Item #2: A proposal from Michael Morton of student government regarding the structure of student representation on the C-6 committee (see Appendix B).

Summary: The committee considered the proposal (appended below) and voted unanimously in favor. The proposal was forwarded to Faculty Council for its approval.

Agenda Item #3: An investigation of responsibility and liability of faculty members leading study abroad trips.

Summary: In response to a request from concerned faculty, the committee took up this matter in order to understand the expected responsibilities of faculty leading study abroad programs, the relevant laws, and UT policies and resources relevant to this issue.

At the request of the committee, we received three reports from individuals (or offices) with information on this matter. Below, we append these reports from (1) Jessica Sentz (see Appendix C) (UT Legal Affairs); (2) David Eaton (see appendix D) (Professor, LBJ school); (3) Philip Dendy (see Appendix E) (UT System, office of risk assessment). Together, these documents summarize the complex legal and landscape in which faculty leading study-abroad programs must operate.

C-7 University of Texas Libraries Committee

The University of Texas Libraries Committee met four times during the fall semester of 2012 and three times during the spring semester of 2013. The committee met in the conference room of the PCL. The main function of the meetings was the exchange of information and perspectives between committee members and UT Libraries administrative staff.

At the meetings, libraries director and Vice Provost Fred Heath described the overall state of the unit as solid, albeit with some challenges. He reported that it has maintained its standing with peers, continued to invest in scholarly materials, and even developed new initiatives (which are noted below). This was done by reducing staffing levels and streamlining operations.

As in 2011-12, one of the main topics of committee discussion was the continuing budgetary challenge. Projections provided by the administrative staff indicated funding stability for the next few years. However, this could change due to factors such as increases in the costs of scholarly communications (particularly journal subscriptions). The committee appreciates the support of the University administration for scholarly communications, which are crucial to research and teaching across campus.

To enhance funding, the libraries have initiated a number of development efforts. Chief Development Officer Gregory Perrin discussed a new outreach initiative, a multi-media “roadshow” designed to present an overview of the libraries’ role in the life of a research university. The committee saw PowerPoint slides from the presentation. The libraries also held several “tailgates” at home football games and inaugurated an annual Distinguished Author Dinner (on November 8, featuring Michael White, the Ronald Nelson Smith Chair in Classics and Religious Studies). The committee also discussed naming opportunities in the libraries.

Another topic addressed by the committee was learning in a digital age. The committee and Director Heath discussed the changing needs of University research and teaching and reviewed several initiatives developed by the libraries in response. For instance, we discussed the libraries’ participation in the University’s MOOC efforts via the edX platform. It was noted that MOOCs show promise but can encounter challenges, such as low completion rates. Other developments include the digital delivery of scholarly materials to individual desktops and the continued development of the University’s Institutional Repository. Director Heath also demonstrated “scoUT,” the new integrated search feature on the UT libraries website, which should allow a more effective location of electronic resources.

Administrative staff reported that over the past two years, campus libraries have experienced an average of 2.7 million total visitors per year and circulated an average of 2.25 million physical items per year. To better serve this demand, the libraries continue to adjust the services provided to these students and researchers as well as reconfigure the physical spaces of its buildings. Among the facilities and technology upgrades discussed by the committee, the PCL reference services desk and circulation desk will be combined into a single point-of-service operation during the summer of 2013. Another new initiative is the materials retrievals service, which according to the libraries website “allows patrons to request eligible materials to be retrieved from the shelf and delivered to the UT libraries checkout desk of their choice for pickup.” Student government leaders also discussed the implementation of PCL 24/5, which began as a pilot project on October 15. A future possibility is a redesign of the PCL 2nd floor as a learning commons that would include services provided by campus partners.

In response to committee questions about the new medical school, Director Heath noted that its library would likely be built on existing and expanded electronic resources, augmented with a smaller traditional physical collection. It is also likely that UT libraries will expand staff expertise in health sciences.

A number of additional topics were discussed during the year. These include the collaborative venture with Benson/LLILAS, the Nilsson Lecture in Contemporary Theater and Literature, Science Study Breaks, off-site storage, and A Viva Voz. These efforts spotlight University research strengths, underscore the relationship between libraries and research, engage the broader community in the results of research

activities, and support the increasingly collaborative nature of research. In addition, Linda Abbey (events and external relations officer) discussed the READ poster initiative. In conjunction with the American Library Association's READ initiative, libraries posters were developed with University athletics and development featuring Bevo and Hook 'Em. Sets of the four posters were donated to each of the 655 schools in Central Texas; they are designed to encourage student reading. The topic of potential partnerships between the libraries and the University of Texas Press was also raised; we anticipate that it will be discussed in 2013-14.

Lastly, Michael Winship was elected committee chair for 2013-14.

David Leal, chair

C-8 Parking and Traffic Appeals Panel¹

The Parking and Traffic Appeals Committee reviews the second level of appeals for fines arising from enforcement of the University's parking regulations. A person receiving a parking citation can first appeal to the Parking and Traffic Services staff, and if not satisfied with the result, can appeal to this committee to consider their case for reduction or dismissal of the fine.

The committee is divided into six review panels, each with six or seven members, and a mix of faculty, staff, and students. Each review panel considers a group of appeals, five to ten at a time, over a 2-3-week period. The individual panelists use their UTEID and password to access the web-based site to review the cases. Each case consists of evidence presented by the Parking and Traffic Services Administration and the appellant. After reviewing the case, the panelist enters a vote to uphold, reduce, or dismiss the fine. The committee chair reviews the panelists' votes and comments and makes the final decision on the appeal. There is no further avenue for appeal beyond this committee. Generally, about three quarters of the committee's membership responds when asked to review appeals, and this produces four to six responses per appeal, enough to gain a collective sense of how each appeal is viewed by the committee members.

To date, the committee has considered 143 cases. Of the 143 cases reviewed, the following percentages recognize the committee's overall panel review outcomes.

- Denied – Citation upheld 47.05%
- Fine reduced 26.16%
- Warning 14.98%
- Upheld – Citation dismissed 11.81%

The committee elected Michelle Habeck as committee chair for the 2013-14 academic year.

The chair extends deep appreciation to the committee members for their timely and thoughtful reviews of the cases this year. She is also very grateful for the support of Parking and Traffic Services staff, in particular Jeri Baker, Margaret Rogers, Matthew Enos, Paul Muscato, and Amanda Harkrider.

Michelle Habeck, chair

C-9 Transportation Policies Committee

No report was submitted by the deadline.

Patricia A. Somers, chair

C-10 Recruitment and Retention Committee

This was a rebuilding year for this standing committee. This committee had been inactive throughout the 2011-12 academic year, with no report filed, no continuing faculty involvement, and no specific old business. The committee was convened by Llewellyn Rabenberg three times early in the fall semester and two times in the spring semester.

The most successful of these meetings were informal dialogs with members of the University community who deal with issues of recruitment and retention of at-risk and minority students in their professional

¹ Report was submitted and inserted after document had already been distributed.

positions: Dr. David Laude (senior vice provost for enrollment and graduation management), Ms. Phaedra White (senior program coordinator, University Honors Center), Dr. Gregory Vincent (vice president for diversity and community engagement), and Professor Larry Abraham (interim dean, School of Undergraduate Studies). In these meetings, our diverse committee intuitively acted as a “sounding board” for the professionals. In my opinion, these meetings should be continued as a way for the professionals to receive feedback about their work as it pertains to recruitment and retention from a broad spectrum of the University community. In this small way, the committee may have some influence on the overall infrastructure that the University has devoted to the task of creating an educational community that serves all of Texas.

It is anticipated that the Recruitment and Retention Committee will select one or two initiatives to pursue in the 2013-14 academic year.

Llewellyn K. Rabenberg, chair

C-11 Research Policy Committee

The Research Policy Committee (RPC) resumed this academic year after a hiatus in the 2011-12 year during which the committee did not meet.

The RPC held five meetings this academic year: 9/10/12; 10/8/12; 11/12/12; 1/14/13; and 4/8/13. The initial meeting was convened by Elizabeth Gershoff; through an online poll, Elizabeth Gershoff was elected as chair and Sharon Brown as vice chair. The meetings were well-attended, with between 10 and 15 members at each meeting.

The vast majority of the RPC’s work this year was devoted to understanding the implementation and implications of the UTS 175 policy on conflicts of interest in research and then later of the UTS 180 policy on conflicts of interest and commitment. Over the course of several meetings, the RPC focused its concern regarding UTS 175 on the fact that any activities submitted for review but declared to be not in conflict could still become public record through FOIA requests.

A subcommittee of the RPC (Jon Dingwell, Liz Gershoff, Jim Holcombe, Dean Neikirk, Michael Oden, and Lynn Westbrook) drafted a proposed Faculty Council resolution expressing faculty concerns about UTS 175. Chair Gershoff submitted the resolution to Faculty Council for consideration on 3/25/13, but then retracted it when it was announced that UT System Vice Chancellors Dan Sharporn and Stephanie Huie would be coming to Faculty Council to answer questions about the UTS 180 policy.

On behalf of the RPC, Chair Gershoff submitted a list of questions to Vice Chancellors Sharporn and Huie before their appearance at a Faculty Council meeting on 4/15/13. The committee had many concerns regarding both UTS 175 and the proposed UTS 180, chief among them being that they violate the privacy of UT employees by requiring public disclosure of activities, including those engaged in on their own time and those that have only the “appearance” of conflict. The committee asked explicitly what the legal basis was for requiring such disclosures. Chair Gershoff and committee member Dean Neikirk also spoke at that Faculty Council meeting to voice concerns about UTS 180. The RPC was gratified when Chancellor Cigarroa from UT System announced on 4/17/13 that UTS 180 implementation would be delayed from 5/1/13 to 9/1/13 as a result of the concerns raised by faculty and University administration at the various UT campuses.

In other activities, Susan Sedwick and Amy Always from the Office for Sponsored Projects (OSP) requested committee input into the request for proposals for a new research management system. Two committee members, Chair Gershoff and Sean Banks, attended and provided input to OSP; Chair Gershoff also forwarded suggestions from committee member John Ekerdt to Amy Always.

At its April meeting, the RPC considered an inquiry from Susan Sedwick at OSP regarding whether UT Austin should submit a coordinated response to the National Science Foundation’s request for information on “Reducing Investigator’s [*sic*] Administrative Workload for Federally Funded Research.” The committee decided that it would be best for individual investigators to respond to the request rather than to have UT Austin provide an institutional response.

Early in the fall, committee members were asked to vote on what topics the RPC should focus on for the year. Twelve members participated in an online poll and generated the following list of top priorities for topics of interest:

1. How can we further support and promote cross-disciplinary research? (two suggested)
2. What can be done to improve the sharing of research findings?
3. How can the EUREKA database be renovated? What other platforms exist to post research opportunities, and should they be standardized across campus?
4. How well are funding and resources facilitated to researchers?
5. What are the University policies that interfere with the conduct of research, and can implementation of these policies be improved? E.g., how can the conflict of interest policy be streamlined?
6. What research tools are people using to enhance their research (e.g., data collection programs, project management software)? And how can our committee help promote good research tools for use across campus?

With so much time devoted to the important issues concerning UTS 175 and UTS 180 this past year, the RPC did not spend much time on the issues above and will endeavor to address them in the coming year.

Elizabeth Gershoff, chair

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

Summary: The committee remained focused on revising *HOP* 12.C.3 and 12.C.4 to clarify current policies concerning graduate student workers. Although the committee voted in favor of a new exception that has been implemented in the Office of Graduate Studies, further action was suspended for several reasons (see item 1 below). Other issues that came up during the year included TA evaluations (item 2), the University's legal liability for TAs who begin working before the contractual start dates of September 1 and January 16 (item 3), and the committee's responsibilities regarding undergraduate workers (see item 4).

1. Graduate Student Workers: Last year, suggested revisions to *HOP* 12.C.3 and 12.C.4 (now *HOP* 9-2030) met with some resistance from faculty who were dissatisfied with current policies that create hardships for units in low budget situations. We learned from Terry Kahn, associate dean in the Office of Graduate Studies, that an exception has been implemented *that allows GRA appointments, "not to exceed 2,500 dollars and not to exceed 80 total hours, without registration" in the summer or at a "reduced minimum registration" of six hours during the long term* in such cases. The Office of Graduate Studies treats these cases as an exception, rather than a policy. For this reason and because dollar amounts may change over time, no further action is required at this time. The committee may want to consider submitting an explanation of the exception along with new wording for the graduate portions of *HOP* 9-2030 if it decides to resubmit revisions in the future since the exception addresses the issues raised by dissenting faculty and may thus help the measure pass. Amy Greenspan, student employer coordinator, noted that it might be best to table all revisions for the present given that further changes involving health insurance may be required in the near future. Addressing all changes at the same time might be more efficient.
2. TA Evaluations: Eugenio (Jay) Santillan (representative, Graduate Student Assembly) raised a question regarding the legality of TA evaluations in the RTF department. The chair made inquiries, but was unable to receive confirmation either way. The committee may wish to seek further clarification from the office of legal affairs.
3. Legal Liability for TAs who begin working before official employment start dates: Brian Evans brought an issue involving TA appointments to the attention of the chair and vice-chair of the C-12 committee. Classes routinely begin before the official start dates of September 1 and January 16. This raises a question about insurance coverage. Are TAs covered when they begin working or is coverage delayed? The chair made inquiries, but no information has been forthcoming.
4. Mission, Charge, and Committee Name: A concomitant issue that emerged during the 2011-12 academic year involving the committee's charge remains unresolved. Although the committee is specifically charged with addressing the rights and welfare of *graduate* student academic employees, issues involving *undergraduate* student employees have also routinely been discussed. The committee may therefore wish to consider submitting a recommendation to the Faculty Council to amend its

mission, charge, and name to include undergraduate student employees. With respect to future revisions to the *HOP*, Andrea Gore has suggested that it might be best to separate *HOP* policies into two categories, one for graduate students and one for undergraduate students.

Edward R. Pearsall, chair

C-13 Information Technology Committee

During the 2012-13 academic year, the C-13 committee provided input and feedback related to a number of University information technology initiatives and issues. Paul Resta (College of Education) served as chair of the committee and Betsy Greenberg (Red McCombs School of Business) was vice chair.

The committee met throughout the academic year to discuss University IT needs, initiatives, and policies and to provide helpful feedback and recommendations to the chief information officer and the Faculty Council. The committee met on the following dates: September 10 and 28, October 26, November 30, January 25, February 22, March 22, April 19, and May 3. The minutes of the meetings were prepared and made publicly available. During the initial meeting, Brad Englert, chief information officer, provided an overview of the IT governance structure and discussed the increasingly important role the committee plays in the structure. The following is a summary of major issues and recommendations made by the committee:

Canvas pilot. The committee had multiple briefings on the status of the pilot and results of feedback from faculty and students on the use of the Learning Management System (LMS). Committee members who were participating in the pilot indicated they, as well as their colleagues, were very pleased with the affordances of the Canvas LMS. In discussing faculty implications, the committee indicated that the move from Blackboard to Canvas involves more than simply “porting over” the content and will require the faculty to make some changes in both design and content to make optimal use of the new LMS.

Technology response to September 14 UT bomb threat. Most committee members indicated that the notification system worked well. Alerts included the siren, text message, website pop-up, Facebook/Twitter messages, TV, and radio. Network and other means are also being explored. Concerns were expressed by the committee for individuals in areas such as basements where sirens cannot be heard and there is a lack of wireless access. They also felt loudspeaker announcements were needed.

University Mobile Strategy Task Force recommendations report. Mike Horn, Director of Digital Strategy, discussed the University’s commitment to mobile responsive web design, including efforts to provide a personalized, socially engaging experience and customized apps for specific users. A strategy to support mobile use in instruction places a high priority on wireless access in classrooms, and a road map to accomplish this goal is being developed. The task force hopes to submit a large bulk request for funds for the upgrades. Other issues discussed related to the use of mobile devices with Blackboard, Canvas, iTunes U, and EdX.

UT System and EdX. The committee was briefed on UT System’s partnership with EdX and its goal to increase graduation rates by increasing student participation in online courses. It was indicated that the provost was interested in the C-13 Committee’s input on blended and online courses. The committee felt that to achieve online and blended courses of the highest quality, faculty must be provided with successful models for course development and that part of the budget should be allocated to faculty development. The committee indicated that there would likely be strong faculty interest in participating in educational research efforts similar to the ones underway at Harvard, MIT, and Berkeley that use student data generated by these courses. Questions were raised about whether EdX will at some point be a replacement for Canvas, and there were concerns about faculty needing to migrate to a new platform so soon after migrating to Canvas.

Restructuring of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). Plans for changing CTL into a campus hub for teaching and learning research and coordination were discussed, as was the creation of a faculty fellowship program, in which representatives from the colleges would have two-year appointments and serve as liaisons with their departments, helping peers develop online and blended courses. The committee expressed support for the concept.

Big Data. A group from the Texas Advanced Computing Center briefed the committee on TACC's computational capabilities to provide the resources for big data technologies, including high-performance data processing, data analytics, and high capacity data storage. Several faculty members shared how these resources play a critical role in their research and felt that the trends in research toward increasingly more massive and complex data sets will place greater demand on these technologies.

Massive Open and Online Courses (MOOCs). The committee was briefed on the status of UT MOOCs, as well as the emergence of a new platform focused on student collaboration and group learning. Questions were raised about policies regarding rights to the materials, and it was indicated that the policies would be the same as those covering faculty ownership rights for course materials they develop.

Early Academic Warning System (EAWS). The committee discussed with CTL staff the development of EAWS. The system is designed to provide feedback to students and faculty to increase academic success. Although it may be used in any class, it has particular value in large classes where individual feedback from the instructor may not be feasible. EAWS allows instructors to alert students at the first sign of struggle and provide them with resources. The committee expressed interest in seeing the system and providing feedback on it before the student portal is activated.

Analytic Prediction Tools. SITAB's Business Services Committee is working on policies for administrators, college units, and individuals that will govern the access and use of data for the purposes of course improvement and research. Members of the committee expressed interest in staying abreast of this important effort.

Proposal to Change the Composition of the C-13 Information Technology Committee. The committee developed and approved a proposal to change the composition of the committee to include faculty representatives from colleges/schools with faculty IT committees. The rationale for this proposed revision is to provide a broader base of faculty input for the University IT governance process by adding eight more voting faculty members. The college/school faculty IT committees provide an effective means to identify faculty IT concerns and assess the impact on faculty of University and college IT policies and decisions. These members will be able to present their faculty's needs and issues to the committee and disseminate information on committee matters and recommendations to their faculty. Colleges/schools without faculty IT committees will be encouraged to create them. The proposal was submitted to the Faculty Council, and the Committee on Committees provided helpful feedback on procedures required for its implementation. The chair of the C-13 Information Technology Committee was invited to make a presentation of the proposal to the full Faculty Council. It was unanimously approved, and the Faculty Council has sent out the request for nominations.

Election of C-13 IT Committee faculty chair for 2013-14. Dr. Greenberg nominated Chang Liu (College of Communications) to serve as C-13 faculty chair for 2013-14. Derek Chiou (Cockrell School of Engineering) seconded the nomination. All members voted in favor of electing Dr. Liu.

Paul Resta, chair

A-1 Appendix A.

Guidelines for Filing a Claim with CCAFR

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 1st. Alternately, a faculty member could appeal the review outcome to the college [1], wait for the college to report the results of the second review by June 1st, and then appeal to CCAFR.

For tenure and promotion cases, the deadline to submit a CCAFR appeal is the later of January 31st 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.

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.

Evaluation of Assistant Professors who had the probationary period extended (section A.3b).

The tenure probationary period may be extended. For example, a woman faculty member may extend the tenure probationary period by one year for each child born or adopted, 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.

Review of Associate Professors without tenure (section A.3b).

They must apply for tenure immediately after two years in rank.

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 also item (e).

Review of Associate Professors with tenure in rank for 10+ years (section A.4),

Associate Professors with tenure have a right to be evaluated for promotion by their department after completing 10 years in rank, and if denied, every five years thereafter.

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.

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.

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 3.17 as quoted above predates the new 2012-2013 guidelines for faculty annual review [4].

A-1 Appendix B.

1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure by AAUP

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

“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.”

“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.”

“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>

C-2 Appendix A.

PROPOSAL TO THE FACULTY COUNCIL The University of Texas at Austin **Fall Break Proposal from the University Academic Calendar Committee** Fall 2012

Proposal. The University Academic Calendar Committee proposes two amendments to the academic calendar and the Principles for the Development of the Academic Calendar:

1. That we include a Fall Break to occur on the Monday and Tuesday of the ninth week of the fall semester each year. (Please see Appendix [B] for wording of this change in the Principles.)
2. That, to maintain 70 days of instruction in the fall semester, we begin the fall semester the fourth Monday of August. (In accordance with existing Principles.)

Rationale. A two-day break in October would provide an opportunity for students (especially freshmen who are adjusting to the demands of college) to regroup after mid-terms.

Features. The proposed changes would:

- Provide a break in the ten weeks between Labor Day and Thanksgiving
- Preserve the current 12 whole weeks (weeks with classes on all five days) in the fall semester.
- Provide an equal number of semester hours (42) for M-W-F and T-Th classes.
- Largely avoid the OU game weekend, which usually occurs the first or second week of October
- Begin in AY 2014-2015, according to the registrar

Information-Gathering Process. Appendix [C] details our committee's process for gathering information related to this proposal. In particular, Table 1 in the appendix lists the university stakeholders whose input we solicited. That input reflected support for, opposition to, and concerns about our proposal.

Support. The student body favors this proposal, as evidenced in the two resolutions passed by student governmental bodies in spring 2012 and passed again (with cognizance of issues raised by the Academic Calendar Committee) in fall 2012. Many individuals from a wide range of academic units also favor this proposal, including stakeholders in the Colleges of Liberal Arts, Education, and Fine Arts, as well as the Jackson School of Geosciences, the Graduate School, the LBJ School of Public Policy, the Schools of Architecture and Information, and the McCombs School of Business. Academic counselors are, in general, strongly in favor. Comments we received in support of the proposal across these stakeholders included "terrific idea," "emphatically for a break," "a great mental health break," "at this point in the semester, my students are experiencing a lot of burnout and it's reflected not just in what they say, but also their demeanor in our interactions," and "helps us deal with the imbalances across classes." Several stakeholders canvassed all of their school's or college's chairs and reported unanimous support. For example, the School of Liberal Arts polled all of its departments and all were in favor, as exemplified by 32 members of the English department writing in favor of the idea (and none writing against).

Opposition. Not everyone favors a Fall Break. The strongest opposition has come from faculty in the Colleges of Natural Sciences and Engineering, both of which run many lab-based classes. As one stakeholder explained, "The effect on lecture courses is minimal. The effect on labs could be significant," and summed up, "We are a solid no, do not do this!" Another wrote, "Labs cannot function with a two day vacation." Although opposition was strong in these schools, it was not universal. One science professor who taught mostly freshmen favored a break; similarly, an engineering chair in support noted, "Once the lab schedule is figured out, it stays figured out." Additionally, eight of ten advisors, coordinators, and program directors in the School of Engineering favored the break.

Concerns. The School of Undergraduate Studies, the College of Communication, the Assistant Deans Council, and academic counselors voiced concerns across a range of issues beyond lab scheduling. The most prominent concern was the impact on staff caused by moving the start date forward. As one person commented, "This plans sounds like it is great for faculty and students, but a horrible deal for staff." Cost was another clear concern, particularly in connection with moving the Gone to Texas Event; this comment reflects that worry, "Not trying to sound like the raincloud here... The main thing that I worry about is in an ever-tightening budget, how it would all pan out in terms of cost." Some stakeholders who favored a break did so while acknowledging that problems might arise, such as rearranging orientation activities; they thought, however, that sufficient notice would minimize the impact. We discuss the main issues that stakeholders raised (either in opposition to

the idea of a break or out of concern about its ramifications) as well as potential resolution of those issues according to the part of the proposal that the issues addressed: Table 2 presents issues related to the early start and Table 3 presents issues related to the two-day mid-October break.

Alternatives. Our committee considered a number of alternatives to a two-day mid-October break, and these alternatives deserve a brief mention here. Not a few stakeholders favored giving the entire week of Thanksgiving off instead of two days in October. Students, however, do not favor that timing because it comes too late in the semester, close to when many projects and papers are due. Moreover, offering a three-day, as opposed to a two-day, break while still maintaining 70 days of instruction (per the Principles) would require starting school even earlier than the fourth Monday of August. Extending the semester at the opposite end of the calendar is infeasible due to the triumvirate of dead days, exams days, and winter holidays. Although the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is willing to grant the university a waiver to allow such an early August start, it seems unlikely that students, staff, and faculty with young school-age children will be willing to start the semester in advance of the AISD start. We considered other arrangements as well (e.g., the Wednesday before Thanksgiving paired with a single day in October), but none seemed as likely as our proposal to address students' need for a mid-term break.

Table 2. Main Issues with Starting Two Days Early and Their Potential Resolution

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Argument</i>	<i>Potential Resolution</i>
<i>Interferes with Gone to Texas</i>	If Gone to Texas is held on a Sunday, the night before the start of classes under this proposal, some individuals may not want to attend due to religious beliefs. Additionally, some colleges may not be able to afford overtime pay to staff to assist with Gone to Texas over the weekend. Overall, costs for the university and for individual colleges and schools may rise by 30% or more.	We met with Rod Caspers and Doug Bolin of University Events. They note that a change would indeed be a serious disruption. Other dates, however, might work for the university-wide culminating event at the Tower (e.g., the Friday before school starts or the Friday of the first week). The event would then change in tone and content; schools and colleges would need to reconfigure their events. All told, shifting Gone to Texas is doable, but not trivial.
<i>Stands to Increase Staff Workload</i>	The smaller colleges may not have enough advisors to simultaneously do end of summer graduation processing of grades and certification (summer grades are not due until the fourth Monday of August, hence the processing of them would fall during the first week of classes), the final fall orientation advising, Gone to Texas, and other start-up events.	We met with Erika Frahm, president of the Staff Council. If Gone to Texas is moved to the weekend before classes start, solutions to the problem of staff overload, which will likely be greatest in the small schools, will be needed. If Gone to Texas is moved to the Friday before or after classes start, we think this strain should be largely, albeit not completely, alleviated.
<i>Conflicts with UGS Freshman Reading Round-Up</i>	This event, in its ninth year and held the day before the first class day, might not get the same turnout (~1000 students) if held on the weekend or the week before classes start. The event relies entirely on voluntary participation of 50+ faculty and needs 50-60 small to mid-sized centrally- located rooms simultaneously.	We spoke with Lara Harlan, director of the event. She sees the most difficulty in a Sunday or Friday evening slot for this event. Other dates are possible, but faculty and student participation might be more difficult to secure.
<i>Coincides with AISD Start</i>	Because the Austin Independent School District starts classes on the fourth Monday of August, moving our start day to this same date would increase traffic on that day.	Traffic may indeed be higher that day if parents drive children to school instead of putting them on the bus. The campus community would need to bear that in mind when making travel plans.

Table 3. Main Issues with a Mid-October Break and Their Potential Resolution

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Argument</i>	<i>Potential Resolution</i>
<i>Poses Problems with Lab-Based Classes</i>	Lab-based classes, such as those in the natural sciences and engineering, currently have 12 whole weeks in the fall. Whole weeks are needed because set-ups are done over the weekends to allow all students to complete the same lab in the same week.	The problem of adds/drops is primarily with automatic ones in the first 4 days, which would fall in the first week under our proposal. Under the current schedule, the 4 th day of automatic add/drop falls in the second week, arguably removing that week as a full week,

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Argument</i>	<i>Potential Resolution</i>
	Although the proposed change preserves 12 whole weeks, stakeholders argue that the first week of classes is not practical for labs due to student adds and drops. A break in the middle of the semester causes disruption on top of that introduced by Thanksgiving. Eleven weeks are insufficient given accreditation concerns.	leaving only 11 weeks. Top ranked schools, including Yale, Brown, Michigan, UC Berkeley, and Ohio State, have only 11 whole weeks in the fall; Harvard has only 10. Thus, accreditation must be possible with only 11 weeks. Certainly, the break would require changes in the lab schedule, but they should be a one-time cost.
<i>Disrupts Recruitment</i>	A mid-October break would come at a peak time for interviewing on campus (interviewing rooms in some schools are fully booked), especially for upper division students, and it would be difficult to schedule potential employers around those dates.	No one is saying that students on the market for a job should go home or away for this break; in fact, they can use a fall break to polish their resume and to interview. A fall break should be a boon to their cause, and recruiters might move events to this break.
<i>Disrupts Advising</i>	A mid-October break would occur in the middle of registration advising, pushing an already tight schedule because advising starts much earlier in some schools than is listed on the academic calendar.	Conceivably, advising could be advanced by two days, a move that would require the spring schedule to be available earlier.
<i>Competes with Family Weekend</i>	As proposed, the fall break would end the Tuesday of the same week that Family Weekend is held. Some families may not be able to incur the cost of their student traveling home at the beginning of the week that they will be traveling to visit campus.	It is unclear that students will travel during the fall break. They may use it as a time to relax and regroup on campus. New events might emerge that would attract them to stay. Nonetheless, Family Weekend may experience a drop in participation.

C-2 Appendix B.

CHANGES TO PRINCIPLES

(changes appear in **bold text** in Principle 3 below)

Principles for the Development of the Academic Calendar

These principles were originally promulgated in April 1975, and amended by the University Council in April 1979; March 1983; and February 1984; and by administrative action in June 1990. They were amended by the University Council in April 1992, and again by the Faculty Council in April 2007.

1. Coordinating Board guidelines shall be followed in establishing the beginning dates, length of session, and ending dates of all sessions.
2. The committee considers a seventy-five day semester (comprising forty-five Monday, Wednesday, and Friday meeting days and thirty Tuesday and Thursday meeting days) to be ideal in length. Realizing the impossibility of achieving this in the fall semester, the committee holds that there shall be a minimum of seventy class days in a semester (forty-two Monday, Wednesday, and Friday meeting days and twenty-eight Tuesday and Thursday meeting days).
3. In the fall, Labor Day will be observed, **a Fall Break will be observed (Monday and Tuesday of the ninth week of the semester)**, and the three-day Thanksgiving holiday (Thursday through Saturday) will be observed.
4. In the spring, Martin Luther King Day will be observed.
5. In the spring, the University will recess for one week's vacation beginning the Monday after the eighth week of classes.
6. In the summer, Independence Day (July 4) shall be observed if it falls on a weekday.
7. Long-session semesters should begin on Monday whenever possible. Long-session graduation days should occur on Saturday, except when the fall graduation day would otherwise be on December 25, then Friday, December 24, will be designated graduation day.
8. The following pattern for setting final examination periods in the long session should be observed:

Friday — Last class day
 Saturday
 Sunday — No-class day
 Monday — No-class day
 Tuesday — No-class day
 Wednesday — Exam day #1
 Thursday — Exam day #2
 Friday — Exam day #3
 Saturday — Exam day #4
 Sunday — No-class day
 Monday — Exam day #5
 Tuesday — Exam day #6
 Wednesday
 Thursday
 Friday
 Saturday — Graduation day

9. There shall be at least one full week between Commencement in the spring and the beginning of the summer session and at least one full week between graduation day in the summer and the beginning of the fall semester.
10. The summer session shall be of eleven weeks duration, comprising two five and one-half week terms (including registration, class days, and examination days). A schedule will also be provided for nine-week and whole-session courses. There will be a minimum of twenty-five class days in the first term and twenty-five class days in the second term. Second-term registration will run concurrent with the first-term final examinations.
11. Two-day periods for examinations shall be provided for all summer terms and sessions.

12. The calendar of the School of Law is established by the School of Law. It must conform to Coordinating Board principles and to the rules of the American Bar Association. In setting its calendar, the School of Law shall also follow the pattern established by the preceding principles as closely as possible.
- 13.¹ The calendar for the MBA program in the McCombs School of Business is established by the McCombs School of Business. It must conform to Coordinating Board principles. In setting its calendar, the McCombs School of Business shall also follow the pattern established by the preceding principles as closely as possible.

¹ Revision approved by the Faculty Council on January 25, 2010, and approved by the president on [March 18, 2010 \(D 7791-7806\)](#).

C-2 Appendix C.

COMMITTEE'S INFORMATION-GATHERING PROCESS

Background. In spring 2012, the Student Government and the Graduate Student Assembly passed resolutions in favor of a fall break, which our committee had begun investigating in fall 2011. We strove to first ensure feasibility of a break, and then to assess its desirability.

Feasibility. We found no university or regulatory restrictions that would prevent a fall break. Specifically, a fourth Monday start date does not violate Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) guidelines, nor, according to the university housing staff, does it pose a problem in switching student residences over from summer session to fall session. In fact, the THECB is willing to grant the university, if needed, a 10-year waiver, with possibility of renewal, if we wished to push our start date even earlier. Under the current proposal, however, no such waiver is required.

Desirability. Our committee sought feedback via individual emails in spring 2012 from more than 30 stakeholders across campus on the idea, in general, of a fall break. Please see Table 1 for a list of stakeholders, among which was a number of associate and assistant deans in charge of student affairs and academic programs across the university's schools and colleges. The list also included directors of various operations, athletics directors, and presidents of staff and faculty councils. In fall 2012, we again sought feedback from these stakeholders on the specific timing of the Monday and Tuesday of the ninth week, with the two-day early semester start. In each round of feedback, many stakeholders forwarded our request for feedback to staff and faculty in their units and passed that input on to us, thereby increasing our reach. For example, in the College of Engineering, the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs provided feedback from faculty chairs as well as ten directors, coordinators and advisors; in the College of Natural Sciences, the Associate Dean for Curriculum and Programs forwarded input from three department chairs, who had canvassed their faculty members; the president of the Academic Counselors Association polled his university members via a two-question survey and forwarded to us the 38 detailed responses he received. Overall, we received responses from all but 5 of the 38 stakeholders on our list. Responses ranged from highly in favor to strongly against the proposed break.

Exploring Issues. We concluded our process by exploring issues put forward in opposition to or in concern over our proposal. Our goal was not to achieve solutions, which in some cases fall beyond the scope of this committee, but to determine the contours and boundaries of each issue and to identify, where possible, potential solutions or insurmountable obstacles. To this end, we culled from the responses the main issues and followed up with key individuals across campus or in the community who might best help us sort them out. We summarize those issues and the results of our inquiries in our proposal.

Resolution. Because we concluded from our inquiries into the issues raised that the main arguments had reasonable potential solutions, we have put forward this proposal for a fall break.

Table 1. List of Stakeholders Contacted by the University Academic Calendar Committee

1	Bernstein	Mark	Associate Dean for Student Affairs	College of Communication
2	Rocha	Darrell	Assistant Dean for Student Affairs	College of Communication
3	Flores	Richard	Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	College of Liberal Arts
4	Gore	Patricia	Assistant Dean for Student Affairs	Cockrell School of Engineering
5	Field	Sherry	Associate Dean for Teacher Education, Student Affairs, and Administration (Spring 2012)	College of Education
6	Maloch	Beth	Associate Dean for Teacher Education, Student Affairs, and Administration (Fall 2012)	College of Education
7	Hale	Kenneth	Senior Associate Dean (Spring 2012)	College of Fine Arts
8	Martin	Rachel	Assistant Dean for Student Affairs (Fall 2012)	College of Fine Arts
9	Kopp	Sacha	Associate Dean for Curriculum and Programs	College of Natural Sciences
10	Davis	Pat	Senior Associate Dean, Academic Affairs	College of Pharmacy
11	Kahn	Terry	Associate Dean, Graduate Student Services	Graduate School
12	Bennett	Philip	Associate Dean, Academic Affairs	Jackson School of Geosciences
13	Stolp	Chandler	Associate Dean, Academic Affairs	LBJ School of Public Affairs
14	Newman	Paul	Senior Associate Dean	McCombs School of Business
15	Oden	Michael	Associate Dean, Research and Operations	School of Architecture
16	Doty	Philip	Associate Dean	School of Information
17	Ramos	Rey	Assistant Dean, Student Affairs	School of Law
18	Carpenter	Linda	Assistant Dean, Student Affairs	School of Nursing
19	Schwab	James	Associate Dean and Graduate Advisor	School of Social Work
20	Abraham	Lawrence	Associate Dean	School of Undergraduate Studies
21	Leslie	Steven	Provost	Administration
22	Reagins-Lilly	Soncia	Senior Associate Vice President for Student Affairs	Office of the Dean of Students
23	Gonzalez	Juan	Vice President for Student Affairs	Student Affairs
24	Roeckle	Charles	Deputy to the President	Office of the President
25	Raney	Mike	Assistant Dean, Chair of the Assistant Deans Committee (Spring 2012)	College of Natural Sciences
26	Spight	David	Assistant Dean, Chair of the Assistant Deans Committee (Fall 2012)	School of Undergraduate Studies
27	Martinez	Marla	Associate Vice President, University Operations	University Operations
28	Kress	Debra	Associate Vice President, Human Resources	University Operations
29	Kraal	Steven	Senior Associate Vice President, Campus Planning and Facilities Management	University Operations
30	Harkins	Bob	Associate Vice President, Campus Safety and Security	University Operations
31	Aebersold	Liz	Director	ITS Communication and Strategy Management
32	Dodds	DeLoss	Athletics Director	Men's Athletics
33	Plonsky	Christine	Athletics Director	Women's Athletics
34	Thomas	Theresa	President, Executive committee (Spring 2012)	Academic Counselors Association

35	Vickers	Nathan	President, Executive committee (Fall 2012)	Academic Counselors Association
36	Frahm	Erika	Chair	Staff Council
37	Friedman	Alan	Chair (Spring 2012)	Faculty Council
38	Hilley	Martha	Chair Elect (Spring 2012) and Chair (Fall 2012)	Faculty Council

C-2 Appendix D.**INFORMATION FROM UNIVERSITIES WITH FALL BREAKS**

In March 2013, the university academic committee contacted 11 universities seeking data associated with their fall break. In each case, we contacted a senior administrator (a vice president, a vice provost, or a registrar) who seemed most likely to be familiar with the creation of fall break at that university. We sent an email to that person explaining our upcoming vote and asking for any data they might have from before or after commencing their own fall break. We also examined the academic calendar at each university to get a sense for the placement and timing of their fall break. Table 1 summarizes what we learned from each university. We sampled a range of universities, aiming primarily, but not exclusively, for universities that were similar to us in their status as a large, top-ranked research university.

Table 1. Fall Break Data from Eleven Universities

	School	Break	Start of fall classes	End of fall classes	# Whole Weeks	Information Pertaining to Fall Break Creation or Outcomes
1	Purdue	Oct 8-9, M-T	Aug 20	Dec 8	13	Introduced in the late 70s early 80s based on stress data, individuals involved long since gone. No data.
2	Cornell	Oct 8-9, M-T	Aug 22	Dec 1	11	Fall break instituted "so many years ago I forget." No data.
3	Yale	Oct 24-26, W-F	Aug 29	Dec 7	11	Instituted the break just last fall. Did not gather any data re: retention and the like before the break, but did just conduct a survey of professors to learn their opinion of it. Have yet to analyze the survey data.
4	Michigan	Oct 15-16, M-T	Sept 4	Dec 11	11	Have had a fall break for 5-6 years; According to the VP for student affairs, it "makes an important difference in students' mental health." No data.
5	UNC-Chapel Hill	Oct 17-19, W-F	Aug 21	Dec 5	11	Fall break has "long been a part of our calendar." No data.
6	UConn	Thanksgiving week	Aug 27	Dec 7	11	Implemented an October break in 1996, switched to the week of Thanksgiving off in 2004. Since then, student health advocates have tried several times to restore the October break, but faculty protested each time, unwilling to give up Thanksgiving week off. No data.
7	U Illinois U-C	Thanksgiving week	Aug 27	Dec 12	11	No reply.
8	Southern Illinois - Carbondale	Oct 8-9, M-T	Aug 20	Dec 8	13	No reply.
9	Notre Dame	Oct 15-19, M-F	Aug 21	Dec 6	11	Have had a week-long fall break in mid-October for 50 years. No data.
10	Rice	Oct 11-12, Th-F	Aug 20	Nov 30	12	No reply.
11	Harvard	Columbus Day	Sep 4	Dec 4	10	Have had a fall break since 1910 (i.e., for over 100 years). No data.

Summary

Of the 11 universities,

- 6 have a two-day break in mid-October
- 2 have a three-day break in mid-October
- 1 has a one-day break in mid-October
- 2 take off all of Thanksgiving week

Of the 11 universities,

- 1 has 10 whole weeks
- 7 have 11 whole weeks
- 1 has 12 weeks (but starts on a Monday, so by UT lab logic has only 11 usable weeks)
- 2 have 13 weeks (but start on a Monday, so by UT lab logic have only 12 usable weeks)

C-6 Appendix A.**MEMORANDUM:**

TO: Faculty Council, Education Policy Committee

FROM: Heather Barclay Hamir, Director, Study Abroad

DATE: September 11, 2012

RE: Affiliated Studies Credit

We seek to align affiliated studies (AS) credit with reciprocal exchange credit (SAB) so that credit earned on all UT-approved study abroad programs has the same academic characteristics. This change would eliminate differences in how study abroad credit fulfills in-residence requirements and would increase student accountability for grades earned on affiliated programs.

Existing Policies

Undergraduate Catalog, Graduation, General Requirements (2. a, b, & c)

<http://catalog.utexas.edu/undergraduate/the-university/graduation/general-requirements/>

Rationale

The University of Texas at Austin created the Affiliated Studies (AS) registration category in the early 1990s when programs offered by third party providers were first introduced at the institution. Traditionally, “affiliated studies” as a registration category has been synonymous with third party provider programs. However, the AS registration category has expanded over time to include enrollment in courses taught abroad by local faculty as part of a UT faculty-led program and enrollment in other universities where a bi-lateral exchange agreement is not possible. By summer 2012, over 40% of undergraduates abroad will earn credit through the AS registration category.

Programs using AS registration are an important part of UT’s study abroad portfolio, yet the credit earned in these programs differs from credit earned in exchange and faculty-led programs, which creates artificial incentives and disincentives for students to participate. AS credit is a variation of transfer credit; although the credit attributes were revised in 2006 to more closely resemble in-residence UT credit, credit earned through AS registration still does not meet all UT residency requirements. These differences deter transfer students and students further into their degrees from participation in programs with affiliated registration, even if the program is the best fit for them academically. At the same time, grades in these courses do not calculate into the UT GPA, and courses in which a student earns a D or F abroad are not posted to the academic record. Some students see this as an advantage, and feel less accountability toward their academic performance in affiliated programs since they perceive that their grades do not count. Both elements of AS credit influence students’ decision making process, sometimes outweighing academic fit as the deciding factor in program selection.

Programs using the AS registration category expand access to study abroad for students who need courses in a particular discipline, additional support services, or who are interested in studying in regions where other program options are limited or non-existent. All programs using the AS registration type have been vetted and approved for the enrollment of UT students based on the quality of academic offerings and student support services, health and safety matters, and cost. As an institution, we rely on these programs to serve our students;

we are therefore proposing a revision to AS credit so that credit awarded in these programs has the same attributes as any other credit earned in approved UT study abroad programs.

Support

This proposal has been reviewed and has the support of the following individuals and groups: Dr. Janet Ellzey, Vice Provost for International Programs; Shelby Stanfield, Vice Provost and Registrar; and the Study Abroad Advisory Council, comprised of college and school representatives with responsibility for international activities, which approved a motion to pursue this modification to UT policy at their March 2012 meeting. We have also consulted with Graduate and International Admissions to ensure that this policy change will not be an administrative burden or at odds with any other policies, and have received unanimous support for this change from a working group of senior academic advisors consulted on this proposal.

Thank you for consideration of this request.

C-6 Appendix B.

**Proposed Restructuring of Student Representation on
the International Programs and Studies General Faculty Standing Committee**

Current Structure

Two Students:

Student Government representative

Student Government representative

Proposed Structure

Two Students:

Senate of College Councils representative

Student Government representative

Reasoning

- Senate of College Councils has an Academic Enrichment Committee which, among various topics, focuses on issues concerning study abroad, international opportunities for students, and resources for international students
- Senate has a strong relationship with the International Office and the Study Abroad Office which has included working to promote study abroad curriculum integration packets and establishing a study abroad scholarship
- Because Senate is charged as “the official voice for students in academic affairs” a restructuring would allow for student representation on the Committee to bring both an academic (via Senate’s representative) and student life (via Student Government’s representative) perspective
- Full support from Student Government’s administration

C-6 Appendix C.**MEMORANDUM**

From: Jessica Sentz

Date: February 20, 2013

Subject: Potential personal liability for faculty-led study abroad programs or courses

Background

By memorandum dated September 24, 2012, Professor David Eaton (LBJ School) asks President Powers to answer the following questions at the General Faculty meeting scheduled for October 15, 2012:

1. Is it true that faculty and staff who allow or supervise students who travel out of the country on university-sanctioned educational programs have a liability risk in the event that a student is injured, killed, becomes ill, or causes damage to another party; and
2. If such a risk occurs, does there exist insurance coverage that the UT System could purchase that would provide for a legal defense of the staff member or faculty member, if sued by the party who is harmed, including the student, the student's family, or a third party harmed by the student's action?

Short Answer

As a general rule, faculty and staff members supervising or conducting courses in a study abroad program would not be personally liable for the sickness, death or injury of a UT student or third party or for any third-party property damage occurring while abroad provided that the faculty or staff member is acting within the course and scope of employment at the time of the occurrence. Specifically, Chapter 104 of the Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code provides that the State will indemnify and defend State employees in legal actions based on an act or omission by the State employee occurring in the course and scope of the person's employment. Chapter 104 of the Civ. Proc. & Rem. Code does not include any territorial limits that would preclude indemnification for and defense of acts or omissions that occur abroad. Consequently, assuming an employee of the University of Texas at Austin (the "University") is acting within the course and scope of her employment while abroad, such employee would be eligible for indemnification and defense under State law. Ultimately, analyzing a particular employee's risk must be performed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the employee was acting within the course and scope of her employment at the time of the occurrence. Therefore, while the State's provisions regarding defense and indemnification are ones of general application, the facts and the context of the incident giving rise to potential personal liability matter and will inform the legal analysis.

In addition to the protections provided under State law, UT System has an international insurance policy (with a

third-party provider) that could provide additional benefits to these University employees. In the case where a University employee is subject to personal liability for conduct occurring within the course and scope of her employment, it is important to distinguish between the imposition of personal liability and the payment of the assessed liability. It is unlikely that a University employee would be required to satisfy a judgment from his/her personal funds. However, it is important to note that neither State law nor UT System's commercial insurance policy will indemnify or defend employee conduct that is willfully or wantonly negligent and/or criminal. Therefore, while the State employment relationship and UT System's insurance policy extend some level of protection to University employees, it is incumbent upon University employees to act prudently (both within and without U.S. borders).

Finally, the University's Office of Legal Affairs does not have the in-house expertise or knowledge to interpret the laws of a foreign country and cannot predict how a foreign country would apply its laws to a particular situation, including the assessment and imposition of personal liability. In situations where such expertise may be required, the University would have to determine if foreign counsel must or should be retained to advise on those specific issues.

In any event, while there is some risk associated with traveling and working abroad, these risks are not new and no insurance policy or State law exists that would make such a proposition risk free. The best protection for avoiding the imposition of personal liability for one's conduct is to act prudently and with care.

C-6 Appendix D.

Faculty Responsibilities in Study Abroad

David Eaton

Report prepared for the International Programs and Studies Committee

UT/Austin Faculty Council

Draft of June 2013

Each year over hundreds of faculty members of The University of Texas at Austin (UT) develop and direct Maymester, summer, or academic-year programs outside of the United States and supervise exchange and field /study research programs that enroll thousands of UT students who travel abroad as part of their academic study. Some programs are organized through the UT Study Abroad Office, some faculty-led programs are coordinated through colleges or schools, other programs are managed by third parties with UT consent, and students travel as UT employees or as students on individual itineraries arranged through or approved by UT Austin faculty.

The Study Abroad Office publishes a **Faculty Handbook for Developing and Directing Study Abroad Programs** (second edition, 2011) and conducts a required training program for any faculty member who leads such a program; the most recent Health and Safety Workshop for Faculty Directors was held April 23, 2013. While many topics are addressed by existing documents, the International Programs and Studies Committee of the Faculty Council believes that a brief review of faculty responsibilities and UT resources available to assist them would be useful.

This reports seeks to provide information to faculty members on three topics: the current status of international field study within UT, expectations of faculty when leading UT study programs abroad, and UT resources available to faculty when they lead academic programs overseas. This report is not university policy, does not provide legal counsel, does not summarize state law, and is not intended as a comprehensive description or interpretation of the UT rules or regulations covering study abroad programs. programs.

Study Abroad as an Official Faculty Opportunity

When a faculty member develops, supervises or participates in a Study Abroad Program or supervises students who study or conduct research abroad as a part of her/his official duties as a paid employee of The University of Texas at Austin, UT expects that faculty member to follow certain procedures for program development, student selection, creation of academic content, and student supervision in the field. Many of these responsibilities are described in the **Faculty Handbook for Developing and Directing Study Abroad Programs** (second edition, 2011) and listed in Table 1 below. Table 2 lists some of the specific responsibilities of a faculty member while abroad representing UT. These responsibilities translate into general supervision tasks abroad. In the event of any incident, a faculty member would be expected to contact specific UT offices, submit forms or reports, and take preventive or responsive action, as described in Table 3 below.

Health Risk Coverage

Students in study abroad or other UT foreign programs as well as their supervising faculty are required to: (a) purchase personal health insurance from a private carrier of their choice; (b) enroll in International SOS, a health advisory service (UT Membership #11BSGC000037), and (c) purchase international health insurance for the period of the program abroad through Cultural Insurance Services International (CISI), River Plaza, 9 West Broad Street, Stamford CT 06902-3788 (UT Policy #GLB9111679), as underwritten by Chartis Insurance. International SOS can be contacted at telephone 1-215-942-8468 or at the website (need website). CISI can be contacted at 1-203-399-5130 or at the website (need website).

International SOS provides email alerts, country medical and other risk reports, a nurse help line, approval for hospital admissions, reports on road conditions, copies of lost documents and evacuation assistance. These services are available 24 hours per day, both before departure and while abroad. In addition, International SOS can facilitate an immediate connection with UT's risk analyst and the UT Police Department.

CISI coverage includes up to \$15,000 per death benefit; up to \$200,000 for basic medical coverage at 100 percent with no deductible; up to \$5,000 in home country coverage; up to \$5,000 in emergency reunion coverage; up to \$250,000 in emergency medical evacuation costs; and up to \$100,000 in repatriation or return of mortal remains coverage, with costs 100 percent covered. There also is an accidental dismemberment benefit defined as a percentage of the accidental death benefit, depending upon the injury. Information on CIS coverage is available on the website <http://world.utexas.edu/abroad/health/insurance> or from the Study Abroad Insurance Coordinator Ms. Elizabeth McCain at 1-512-47-8855 or via email at Elizabeth.mccain@austin.utexas.edu.

In the event of any medical claim, the person who has suffered the illness or injury is responsible for filing a CISI Medical Claim Form that can be downloaded from the website (website needed). The faculty member responsible for the study abroad program is not responsible for filing a claim form for a student who has experienced an injury or illness.

Workers' Compensation and Employee Liability Coverage

The UT System has purchased foreign workers' liability insurance that covers any injury or occupational illness to a foreign employee of any UT international program that is the result of a specific event or exposure which occurs while in the course and scope of employment while the employee is anywhere in the world, excluding the US and Puerto Rico. This policy (policy number needed) has been purchased from (name of insurer and address needed) that can be contacted at (telephone and email contact needed). This coverage applies to employees hired in the US, employees hired in Canada, and some third-country nationals. Some local hires or third country nationals are not covered, as described in the insurance policy. The policy covers up to \$1 million for supplemental repatriation expenses per person; injury for each covered accident; illness for each covered illness; and illness per covered employee per covered illness. In the event of any incident requiring a claim, the faculty member supervising the study abroad program would be expected to file both a report on the incident with the UT International Office via the emergency telephone at 1-512-669-8488 or email (email), using a form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Foreign Commercial General Liability

The UT System has purchased a foreign commercial general liability policy through (name of company at (address of company) that covers any specified general liability incident that occurs during a Study Abroad program. (Name of company) can be contacted at telephone (telephone needed) or at the website (website needed). This coverage applies to any covered liability in the world outside of the US or Puerto Rico. The policy has upper limits of \$1 million for any single occurrence, any single injury, or any premise damage event. There are upper limits of \$25,000 for medical expenses, \$50,000 for accidental death or dismemberment per person, \$250,000 per incident for death or dismemberment, and \$300,000 per crisis response coverage, including natural disasters. In the event of any incident requiring a claim, the faculty member supervising the study abroad program would be expected to file both a report on the incident with the UT International Office via the emergency telephone at 1-512-669-8488 or email (email), using a form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Foreign Business Auto Liability and Physical Damage

The UT System has purchased a two separate foreign business auto liability and physical damage insurance policies, one for Mexico and one for the rest of the world. The Mexico auto liability policy is purchased through (name of company at (address of company) that covers business auto liability, as well as owned or rented business auto physical damage that occurs during a Study Abroad program. (Name of company) can be contacted at telephone (telephone needed) or at the website (website needed). This coverage applies to an owned or rental automobile in Mexico only. The global auto liability policy (which excludes Mexico) is purchased through (name of company at (address of company) that covers business auto liability, as well as owned or rented business auto physical damage that occurs during a Study Abroad program. (Name of company) can be contacted at telephone (telephone needed) or at the website (website needed). This coverage applies to an owned or rental automobile in any country other than the US, Mexico or Puerto Rico. The limits on coverage are up to \$1 million for auto liability per accident, up to \$25,000 for medical expenses coverage for

each accident, up to \$50,000 in physical damage per owned or rented vehicle per incident and up to \$250,000 in total physical damage for all owned or rented vehicles. In the event of any incident requiring a claim, the faculty member supervising the study abroad program would be expected to file both a report on the incident with the UT International Office via the emergency telephone at 1-512-669-8488 or email (email), using a form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Personal Liability of UT Faculty Supervising Students Outside of the US

Incidents associated with Study Abroad programs that require reports, as listed above, do occur on a routine basis. During Summer Semester 2012 there were 44 incidents reported to UT, including one student death, incidents of robbery and assault as well as hospitalizations. In Fall Semester 2012 there were 13 incidents. During the first half of Spring Semester 2013 there were 18 incidents, including one medical air escort to the US. It would be prudent for any faculty member supervising UT students abroad or organizing a UT study abroad program to understand the nature of any faculty member's personal liability for damages. Laws of the State of Texas, UT Austin rules as well as both UT Austin and UT System insurance products provide significant risk mitigation for UT faculty members. However, there remain liability risks for UT faculty members in supervising or accompanying students abroad, so it is in each faculty member's interest take actions that reduce the likelihood of any successful liability suit against a faculty member as an individual for a activities which are within the course and scope of UT employment.

Ms. Jessica Sentz, Assistant Vice President for Legal Affairs at UT/Austin has written about faculty liability supervising students abroad. Her comments are neither legal advice nor a legal opinion. However, the information may be useful to faculty about their personal liability risks. Any faculty member seeking legal advice regarding their liability risks for supervising student abroad ought to contact their own attorney. The following prose is a re-statement of Ms. Sentz' ideas.

According to Ms. Sentz, the laws of the State of Texas provide that:

"...the State will indemnify and defend State employees in certain causes of action occurring within the State employee's course and scope of employment..." (Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code Section 104.001)

which refers to negligent acts or omissions occurring within the course and scope of duty. This statute does not cover willful or wrongful acts, acts of gross negligence or criminal acts.

The "scope of employment" means that the person is doing the job for which she/he was hired and paid to do. The law states:

"...(T)he performance for a governmental unit of the duties of an employee's office or employment and includes being in or about the performance of a task lawfully assigned to an employee by a competent authority."

(Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code section 101.001 (5))

While it is true that faculty members who supervise students abroad or lead and accompany students in study abroad programs are being assigned by their departments or deans to such duties and are being paid for such work by UT, there is some uncertainty as to whether supervision of study abroad programs is within a faculty member's "scope of employment" because no one at UT has ever written or established a policy that such service is within a faculty member's "scope of employment." It would be useful for an appropriate official at UT to state that faculty members who supervise students abroad or lead and accompany students in study abroad programs are operating within that faculty member's "scope of employment."

Examples of activities that would not fall within the course and scope of a faculty member's duties on a study abroad program include:

* leading or engaging in an activity that has been specifically prohibited by UT, such as giving alcohol to or drinking alcohol with student participants;

* bringing or taking students on a personal trip before, during or after the program has started or ended;

* engaging in physical or intimate relationships with student participants.

Another test of whether liability attaches to a faculty member's actions is whether she/he 'exercises reasonable care in the performance' of official duties. Behavior is reasonable if a person is using her/his best judgment in determining what is appropriate conduct in a given situation. According to Ms. Sentz, the operational test is: 'ask yourself, would I want my son or daughter to do this?' or 'Would I be comfortable calling the parents of the student participant and asking them whether they would be supportive of the proposed activity for their son or daughter.'

According to Ms. Sentz, under Texas law, the limits on indemnification are up to \$100,000 for a single person, up to \$300,000 for a single occurrence in cases of personal injury and death, and up to \$10,000 for property damages. The UT/System insurance policies may provide defense and indemnification to State employees leading UT-approved study abroad programs or trips. These policies would be in excess of anything provided under Texas law. She states that the "...Amount and extent of coverage under this policy would depend on the facts in the case." The current upper limit on UT System's insurance policy is up to \$1 million for bodily injury or property damages occurring abroad. These numbers may vary from year to year.

A faculty member may further protect her/himself from liability risk by taking out a liability policy from a professional association. A key element in whether the faculty member would be covered by such a liability policy is whether the task (leading study abroad) is considered by the university as "within the scope of employment." This fact ought to be a further motivation for UT to clarify its policy regarding UT faculty supervising students abroad or leading study abroad programs.

Table 1**Faculty Responsibilities in Study Abroad Programs**

A faculty member who wishes to organize a Study Abroad Office (SAO)-approved or college/school approved program should follow approved SAO procedures and schedules for such program. The program approval process is described in the **Faculty Handbook for Developing and Directing Study Abroad Programs**; the appropriate schedule for program development can be found on the website: (website needed)

There are distinct roles and responsibilities for diverse stakeholders within any program, including: the SAO (if a SAO program coordinator or SAO staff are involved); UT's International Oversight Committee (IOC); UT's international risk analyst (IRA); UT's travel management service and its travel contractors; the faculty director; college, school or departmental staff; on-site program partners or contractors; international staff (if hired abroad); and participating students. Some of these responsibilities are discussed in the **Faculty Handbook for Developing and Directing Study Abroad Programs**.

Faculty are responsible for screening potential student participants to assure that any applicant: meets minimum grade, motivation or maturity standards; follows required application procedures; registers with MySAO portal; and completes all required form on https://utdirect.utexas.edu/student/abroad/shared_start.WBX. Faculty should be aware of indications that a student is not ready for study abroad, such as: an inappropriate motivations (seeking escape from a person or situation; focus on an extended vacation; or travel with a third party abroad); information from essays or faculty assessments questioning maturity, behavior, poor academic or attendance performance; recent events in the student's life; or inappropriate behavior before or after acceptance into the program.

Faculty are responsible for pre-departure compliance with UT, state and federal rules and expectations for an educational and working environment that provides equal opportunity to all members of the University community, including discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability, citizenship and veteran status. Supplemental information can be obtained from the UT director of equal opportunity services (phone: 512-[phone needed] or email: [email needed]) or from the UT website: [website needed].

Faculty abroad are responsible for their program's academic content and instruction. Faculty also serve as UT field representatives abroad during program hours, evening and weekends throughout the program's duration in matters affecting participants or the program. Table 2 lists some specific expectations. Table 3 lists specific actions and forms required.

Table 2

Role of a Program-Abroad Faculty Director

Role Representing

Emergency “on duty” contact* SAO, IOC and IRA

Student attendance at orientations, classes, SAO, Dean of Students
field study and program activities

Arranging and supervising transportation, UT Departmental staff
lodging, meals, tours and field study

Crime and security management (Cleary Act) UT Police, Dean of Students

Title IX Coordinator (sexual discrimination, UT Dean of Students
sexual harassment, sexual misconduct)

Crisis management UT International Office

Behavioral concerns or conduct violations UT International Office, Dean of Students

Housing security, fire safety Texas State Fire Marshal

* A faculty director should not travel away from the program site or from the group during the program without appointing an appropriate second individual who is properly prepared and trained to serve as emergency contact and respond to other issues, as identified above.

Table 3**Specific Expectations of UT Faculty While Abroad****Emergency Response**

Faculty role: Faculty represent the responsible UT authority, in lieu of UT International Office, to respond to any emergency.

Trigger of Action: The faculty member herself/himself may initiate action or any report by a student of an emergency (which could be a risk to the student, to others, or to the group) would trigger a response.

Required Actions: Faculty ought first assure students' safety and then report the incident immediately to the International Office via UT international emergency telephone: 1-512-669-8488 or email: (email) and to the International SOS program: 1-215-942-8478 at the website: (website). Probable contacts: Erin Wolfe, Heather Barclay Hamir, or any other person who responds to the emergency phone. Faculty should then file an incident report, on the form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Other Actions Required: UT's International Crisis Advisory Team will inform the faculty member regarding what additional actions the faculty member should take.

Sexual Misconduct

Faculty role: Faculty represent the responsible UT authority, in lieu of UT's Title IX Coordinator and UT Dean of Students, to respond to any incident of sexual misconduct, sexual discrimination, or sexual harassment.

Trigger of Action: The faculty member herself/himself may initiate action or any report by a student of a circumstance of sexual misconduct, sexual violence, sexual discrimination or sexual harassment by any student, faculty member, staff member, visitor to campus, contractor or other person would trigger a response.

Required Actions: Faculty ought first assure students' safety and then report the incident immediately to: the International Office via UT international emergency telephone: 1-512-669-8488 or email: (email) and the UT campus institutional Title IX coordinator (Dr. Jennifer Hammat, telephone: 1-512-[phone number], and email: [email]). Faculty should then file an incident report, on the form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Other Actions Required: Dr. Hammat or her designee will inform the faculty member regarding what additional actions the faculty member should take.

Information: Faculty can find additional information regarding Title IX regulations at the website (website needed) and the authorizing Title IX legislation at the website (website needed).

Crime or Cleary Offense

Faculty role: Faculty represent the responsible UT authority, in lieu of UT's Dean of Students, UT's Office of Institutional Equity, UT's Cleary Coordinator and UT's Police Department to respond to any incident that could be considered a crime or a Cleary Offense. These offenses include: murder; non-negligent manslaughter; negligent manslaughter; forcible sexual offenses; non-forcible sexual offenses; robbery; aggravated assault; burglary; motor vehicle theft; arson; hate crimes; or other action that may merit disciplinary action. Hate crimes include all of the crimes listed above that are motivated by bias as well as any larceny/theft, assault, intimidation, destructive property damage, or vandalism. Other actions that may merit grounds for arrest or referral for disciplinary action include weapons possession or carrying, drug abuse violations or liquor law violations.

Trigger of Action: The faculty member herself/himself may initiate action or any report by a student of a possible crime or Cleary Offense would trigger a response.

Required Actions: Faculty ought first assure students' safety and then report the incident immediately to the International Office via UT international emergency telephone: 1-512-669-8488 or email at (email). The faculty should then contact the UT Cleary Coordinator and Title IX coordinator Dr. Jennifer Hammat, telephone: 1-512-[phone number], and email: [email]. Faculty should then file an incident report, on the form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Other Actions Required: Dr. Hammat or her designee will inform the faculty member regarding what additional actions the faculty member should take.

Information: Faculty can find additional information regarding Title IX regulations at the website (website needed) and the authorizing Title IX legislation at the website (website needed). Faculty can find additional information regarding Cleary regulations at the website (website needed) and the authorizing Cleary legislation at the website (website needed).

Student Illness

Faculty role: Faculty represent the responsible UT authority, in lieu of UT's Office of Health Services, to respond to any student's physical or mental illness.

Trigger of Action: The faculty member herself/himself may initiate action or any report by a student of a student illness would trigger a response.

Required Actions: Faculty ought first assure that the student is in a safe place, such as a hospital, health clinic or other appropriate health provider. Faculty are expected to exercise "reasonable care" or "best judgment" in determining what is appropriate conduct in a given situation. Faculty (or, if possible, the student her/himself) should report the incident immediately to the International SOS program at 1-215-942-8478 and also the International Office via UT international emergency telephone at 1-512-669-8488 or email (email). Faculty should then file an incident report, on the form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Other Actions Required: SOS advisors or a member of UT's International Crisis Advisory Team will inform the faculty member regarding what additional actions the faculty member should take.

Information: Faculty can find additional information regarding SOS services at the website (website needed).

Inappropriate Student Behavior or Code of Conduct Violations

Faculty role: Faculty represent the responsible UT authority, in lieu of UT's Dean of Student's Office, to respond to any student behavior or code of conduct violations.

Trigger of Action: The faculty member herself/himself may initiate or any report by a student of inappropriate student behavior or a code of conduct violation would trigger a response. Student signs of distress include: a threat to commit violence against self or others; being out of touch with reality; extreme emotional reaction, either positive or negative; a noticeable change in appearance; a decline in academic performance; or substance abuse, including alcohol

Required Actions: Faculty ought first assure that any student involved is in a safe place. Faculty are expected to exercise "reasonable care" or "best judgment" in determining what is appropriate conduct in a given situation. Faculty should consult with the UT International Office via UT international emergency telephone at 1-512-669-8488 or email (email). In a written report is required, faculty should then file an incident report, on the form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Other Actions Required: The UT International Office staff will inform the faculty member regarding what additional actions the faculty member should take.

Information: Faculty can find additional information regarding UT's student code of conduct at the website (website needed).

Fire and Fire Risk

Faculty role: Faculty represent the responsible UT authority, in lieu of UT's Office of Housing, the UT Office of Legal Affairs, as well as the Texas State Fire Marshal, for assuring compliance with fire safety for college students in any hotel, hostel, dorm, apartment or other residence. For 2013-14 these expectations apply only to locations where students will reside for one month or more; the one-month lower limit may be revised in time. Faculty are responsible for student safety in the event of any actual fire.

Trigger of Action: The faculty member or an UT staff member is responsible for inspection of any prospective student residence as well as dealing with the consequences of any fire.

Required Actions: Faculty are required to file a report on the potential fire risks of any prospective student residence using a standard UT form (see the website:) to Heather Thompson, Assistant Director, Study Abroad, International Office, . In the event of a fire, a faculty member is responsible for student safety and for reporting the fire incident. In the event of a fire, faculty ought first assure that students are in a safe place. Faculty should report the incident immediately to the UT International Office via the international emergency telephone at 1-512-669-8488 or email (email). Faculty should then file an incident report, on the form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Other Actions Required: A member of UT's International Crisis Advisory Team will inform the faculty member regarding what additional actions the faculty member should take.

Information: Faculty can find additional information regarding fire safety requirements at the website (website needed).

Liability Risk

Faculty role: Faculty represent the responsible UT authority, in lieu of UT's Office of Legal Affairs as well as the UT Systems' Office of Risk Management for responding to any liability-related incident associated with a Study Abroad program. This liability could include any injury or occupational illness occurring to a UT employee anywhere in the world outside of the US and Puerto Rico. UT also could be liable for damages due to bodily injury or property damages, whether from an automobile or other event.

Trigger of Action: In the event of an incident of a foreign worker's compensation, auto accident or other foreign commercial general liability, the faculty member is responsible for reporting the incident and using "reasonable care" or "best judgment" in determining what is appropriate conduct in a given situation.

Required Actions: Faculty are required to file a report in a standard format (see the website) on any incident of injury or occupational illness, auto accident, or other event that could led to a UT liability risk. In the event of such an event, faculty are expected to exercise "reasonable care" or "best judgment" in determining what is appropriate conduct in a given situation. Faculty should report the incident immediately to the UT International Office via the international emergency telephone at 1-512-669-8488 or email (email). Faculty should then file an incident report, on the form as posted on the website (website address needed).

Other Actions Required: A member of UT's International Crisis Advisory Team will inform the faculty member regarding what additional actions the faculty member should take.

Information: Faculty can contact Jessica Sentz, LLB, Assistant Vice President, Legal Affairs, telephone 1-512-471-1241 or email Jessica.sentz@austin.utexas.edu for additional information. Ms. Sentz has access to the website of the UT System Risk Mitigation Office for information concerning the various liability insurance programs.

C-6 Appendix E.

FOREIGN PACKAGE POLICY GUIDE

POLICY SUMMARY

U.T. System has over 15,000 travelers going to approximately 150 different countries throughout the world. To help mitigate and transfer the many risks associated with international travel, The Office of Risk Management (ORM) placed an International Package Policy which includes coverage for foreign workers' compensation, foreign business auto, foreign general liability, and a local Mexico general liability and Mexico Tourist auto policy.

The policy automatically includes worldwide coverage, unless specifically excluded under the policy. Current exclusions include Afghanistan, and Iran. Travel to Afghanistan and Iran must be reported to ORM for inclusion before travel occurs.

Foreign Workers Compensation

Foreign Workers Compensation applies to any injury or occupational illness occurring to an employee that is the result of a specific event or exposure which occurs while in the course and scope of employment while the employee is anywhere in the world, including international waters or airspace, but excludes the United States of America (including its territories and possessions), and Puerto Rico. The Foreign Workers Compensation policy contains the following three coverages: Workers' Compensation, Employers Liability, and Excess Repatriation Expenses.

Foreign Commercial General Liability

Foreign commercial general liability pays those sums that U.T. System or its Institutions becomes legally obligated to pay as damages because of bodily injury or property damage. Coverage includes a customized (U.T. specific) general liability endorsement providing coverage for students employed or representing U.T., as well as coverage for participants in any sport or athletic event (coverage is excess of the NCAA Catastrophic Injury Insurance Program).

Mexico General Liability – ORM has purchased a separate general liability policy for Mexico as required by the Mexican authorities.

Foreign Business Auto Liability & Physical Damage

The Foreign Business Auto liability provides coverage for third party liability for incidents occurring outside of the United States arising from the use of owned private passenger or hired vehicles. Physical damage applies to owned autos and hired autos.

Local Mexico Tourist Auto Policy – ORM has purchased a separate Mexico Tourist Auto policy (\$1,000,000 limit). Enterprise Rent-A-Car and Avis have agreed to allow U.T. to use the Mexico Tourist / International Package Policy insurance as primary when operating rental vehicles in Mexico.

For further information on vehicle use in Mexico, please read the Office of Risk Management's [Guidelines for Driving in Mexico Document](#).



HOW TO APPLY FOR COVERAGE

Institutions are responsible for reporting their international travel annually through the International Exposures Survey.

International Package Policy coverage is automatically extended to all institutions and the general liability and auto policy premiums are paid by the institutions based on an allocation provided by the Insurer. Foreign Workers' Compensation insurance premiums are paid by the U.T. System Workers' Compensation Insurance Fund.

LIMITS, DEDUCTIBLES, AND GENERAL PROGRAM CONDITIONS

The following limits apply to the program:

1. Foreign Voluntary Workers' Compensation and Employee Liability:

Classification Of Employee	Part One – Employee Injury Benefits Insurance	Part One – Supplemental Repatriation Expense	Part Two – Employers Liability Coverage
U.S. Employee	State of Hire	Covered	Covered
U.S. Employee Traveler	State of Hire	Covered	Covered
Canadian Employee	Province of Hire	Covered	Covered
Canadian Employee Traveler	Province of Hire	Covered	Covered
Third Country National	Country of Hire	Covered	Covered
Local Hire or National	Not Covered	Not Covered	Covered

Limits of Insurance

\$	1,000,000	Part One: Supplemental Repatriation Expenses Per Person
\$	1,000,000	Part Two: Employers Liability Injury by Accident Each Accident
\$	1,000,000	Part Two: Employers Liability Injury by Disease Coverage Part Limit
\$	1,000,000	Part Two: Employers Liability Injury by Disease Each Employee

Coverage includes:

Assistance Services Explanatory In Rem

Maritime Coverage for Shore-based Employees

War Risk – Employer's Liability (exclusion deleted)

Terrorism – Employer's Liability (exclusion deleted)



2. Foreign Commercial General Liability:

Limits of Insurance (Separate Limits apply per Institution)

\$	2,000,000	Master Control Program Aggregate Limit
\$	1,000,000	General Aggregate Limit
\$	1,000,000	Products - Completed Operations Aggregate Limit
\$	1,000,000	Personal & Advertising Injury Limit
\$	1,000,000	Each Occurrence Limit
\$	1,000,000	Damages to Premises Rented to You Limit
\$	1,000,000	Student / Intern Professional Liability - \$1,000 per occurrence deductible
\$	25,000	Medical Expense Limit
\$	50,000	Accidental Death & Dismemberment Insurance Per Person
\$	250,000	Accidental Death & Dismemberment Insurance Aggregate Per Occurrence
\$	300,000	Crises Response Coverage Extension Endorsment (includes Natural Disasters)

3. Foreign Business Auto Liability & Physical Damage

Foreign Business Auto Liability:

\$	1,000,000	Coverage A: Liability Coverage Limit, any one Accident
\$	25,000	Coverage B: Medical Expense Coverage, each Accident Limit

Foreign Business Auto Physical Damage:

Owned Private Passenger Autos		
\$	Lesser of ACV or \$50,000	Each auto
\$	250,000	Each cause of loss
Hired Autos		
\$	Lesser of ACV or \$50,000	Each auto
\$	250,000	Each cause of loss

The following deductibles apply to the program:

1. Foreign Workers' Compensation: No deductible.
2. Foreign Commercial General Liability: No deductible.
3. Foreign Business Auto Liability & Physical Damage: Liability: No deductible; Physical Damage: \$1,000 each auto.



LOSS REPORTING, POST LOSS PROCEDURES & DOCUMENTATION

For instructions on how to report claims for the various coverage types included under the International Package Insurance Policy, please see the [International Claims Guide](#).

For additional International Package Insurance information, please contact the ORM [Manager of Risk Finance](#).

