

DOCUMENTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES
OF THE GENERAL FACULTY FOR 2014-2015

The annual reports of the standing committees of the General Faculty for 2014-15 received to date are reproduced below.



Dean Neikirk, Secretary
General Faculty and Faculty Council

A. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEES

A-1 Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Committee Members

Brian L. Evans (committee chair), Daniel A. Bonevac, David M. Hillis, Jody Jensen, Desmond F. Lawler, Linda E. Reichl, David S. Sokolow, Rajashri Srinivasan, and Debra J. Umberson

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

The Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR) advises the president and provost on procedures for due process for faculty members, including procedures in tenure, promotion, faculty annual evaluation, and comprehensive post-tenure review cases, as well as safeguards for academic freedom, including those in teaching, research, and expression. CCAFR also investigates claims by faculty members who allege violations of due process or academic freedom principles, especially in their tenure, promotion, faculty annual evaluation, or comprehensive post-tenure review cases. Please refer to [Appendix A](#). For a short summary of academic freedom principles, see [Appendix B](#). Claims of academic freedom violations are not limited to tenure, promotion, faculty annual evaluations, or post-tenure review cases.

In 2014-15, the work of CCAFR can be divided into three separate subjects, and each subject is described in a separate section in this document:

1. Investigations of claims of procedural irregularities in tenure and promotion cases,
2. Recommended revisions to the University tenure and promotion guidelines, and
3. Other open issues to protect academic freedom and strengthen its safeguards.

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

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

In January 2015, five faculty members filed CCAFR appeals, in which they claimed procedural violations concerning tenure and promotion cases. All held the rank of assistant professor. One of them also alleged a violation of academic freedom.

In February, through final arguments, Assistant Professor A received a decision of promotion to associate professor with tenure. As a consequence, the CCAFR appeal was dropped.

Assistant Professor B received a decision of terminal appointment pending in December 2014, and filed a CCAFR appeal in January 2015. The CCAFR subcommittee found that the faculty member's claim of retaliation and conflicts of interest stemming from discrimination charges and whistleblowing had merit. Faculty members on the Executive Committee should have had the option to recuse themselves from the process, especially the vote. Recusing oneself from voting is different than abstaining from voting. The CCAFR subcommittee identified three faculty members (including the department chair) with perceived conflicts of interest. The CCAFR subcommittee recommended that the candidate be reconsidered without prejudice for promotion and tenure, but President Powers disagreed. The CCAFR subcommittee also recommended that the department avoid similar conflicts in the future.

Assistant Professors C and D are in the same department, and received decisions of terminal appointment pending in December 2014. They had many similar claims in their CCAFR appeals, and the CCAFR subcommittee found merit in the following similar claims:

- Dean was not present at the college tenure and promotion deliberations, as required by the University Guidelines, because it is the dean who presents the promotion case to the president's committee.
- Candidate was not given an opportunity to comment on the choice of reviewers before the invitations were sent to the reviewers.
- Assistant Professor on the Executive Committee is not eligible to vote, but his/her vote was counted as abstention, which violated faculty governance standards and weakened the case.
- Departmental promotion subcommittee recorded a vote on the case without access to the external letters and without the benefit of the discussion by the entire Executive Committee, which did not afford the candidate due process.

Although the CCAFR subcommittee expressed concern in the aforementioned procedural errors, Assistant Professor C did not appear to fulfill the written policies in his/her department concerning publishing a significant number of articles in the top five discipline journals. As a consequence, the CCAFR subcommittee concluded in the case of Assistant Professor C that "we do not believe that the ensemble of these procedural violations tainted the outcome of the case to the point that the University should provide reconsideration without prejudice to the candidate." The president agreed. Assistant Professor D had additional claims, as mentioned next.

In addition to the aforementioned claims, Assistant Professor D had two additional significant claims: (1) medical leave in 2010-2011 due to childbirth was not applied to extend her tenure probationary period, and (2) an external letter writer did not evaluate her dossier as if she had completed her work in rank as an assistant professor over the normal five-year period. Assistant Professor D started in rank in fall 2007. Candidate was awarded one year of Junior Faculty Leave in 2011-12 by the college, which caused the tenure clock to stop for 2011-12 because she was appointed at 75 percent time in one semester. Candidate requested Family and Medical Leave in 2010-11 and 2012-13, both due to childbirth.

As per University policies, Assistant Professor D would have completed four years of tenure probation as of September 1, 2014; however, the candidate was told by her department chair that she had to apply for tenure and promotion in fall 2014 because that was in her "up-or-out" year, i.e., after five years of tenure probation. The discrepancy is that the University administration is claiming that Assistant Professor D did not properly file for tenure probationary clock extension for 2010-11. The University administration only recognized extensions in 2011-12 and 2012-13. For the second additional claim,

the external letter writers should have evaluated the promotion case as if all of the work had been performed in a normal five-year period. One reviewer evaluated the candidate over the seven-year period since her PhD, and this reviewer was cited by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee as a primary reason for their largely negative vote.

For Assistant Professor D, the CCAFR subcommittee recommended that “Given the procedural violations described above—specifically the fact that this case was an attempt at early promotion, and thus that next year should not be considered as a terminal year—we recommend that the president grant the faculty member reconsideration, without prejudice, by the department for tenure and promotion.” The president disagreed that it was an early tenure and promotion case because the faculty member did not properly file the University forms for the first childbirth. The CCAFR chair wrote a rebuttal to the president, including new information about the mishandling of the request for a tenure probationary clock extension for 2010-11 by the department and the college for the first childbirth. The president disagreed with this rebuttal.

There is no Assistant Professor E, but there is an Assistant Professor F discussed next.

Assistant Professor F had received a terminal appointment pending decision in December 2013, filed a CCAFR appeal in January 2014, and received a CCAFR recommendation of being “granted, without prejudice, reconsideration for promotion and tenure.” The president agreed. (Assistant Professor F herein is the same Assistant Professor F in the 2013-14 CCAFR Annual Report.) Assistant Professor F applied for tenure and promotion in the 2014-15 academic year and received a terminal appointment pending decision once again. Assistant Professor F filed a CCAFR appeal in January 2015. The CCAFR subcommittee found the department had substantially fixed their procedures for tenure and promotion vs. the previous year. Nonetheless, the CCAFR subcommittee found two procedural errors— denial of access to a draft document about his/her promotion case that was voted on by the Executive Committee, and inclusion of the faculty member’s teaching reviews prior to being in rank as if they were in rank. The CCAFR subcommittee did not believe that the two procedural errors tainted the tenure and promotion case to the point of having to redo it. The president agreed.

2. Revision of University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure at All Faculty Ranks

Each year, the CCAFR chair provides recommendations to the provost’s office concerning the content in the *University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure at All Faculty Ranks*: <https://utexas.app.box.com/p-and-t-general-guidelines>.

After feedback from CCAFR and other faculty committees, the provost’s office overhauled these University Guidelines for fall 2012. The new format separates responsibilities for administrators and for applicants, which is quite helpful for both groups of constituents. The provost’s office continues updating these guidelines each year.

Here are several recommendations for improvements to the Fall 2015 *University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure at All Faculty Ranks* (hereafter “University Guidelines”) based on CCAFR reviews of tenure and promotion denial claims conducted over the last six years:

A. College and Departmental Guidelines (Section A.1)

The University Guidelines say “Candidates should check with their department chairs or, in non-departmentalized colleges/schools, with their dean regarding the requirements and practices in their area.” We recommend adding wording such as “The department chair or, in non-departmentalized colleges/schools, the dean, shall disseminate all faculty promotion guidelines specific to the college/school to each faculty member in the college/school on an annual basis.” For example, the McCombs School of Business (and some of its constituent departments) has specific guidelines on research publication venues and the relative importance of these venues.

B. Extensions of Tenure Probationary Period (Section A.3.b)

After “Candidates whose probationary period has been extended under HOP 2-2020 due to leave

without pay in accordance with University family and medical leave policies shall be evaluated as if the work were done in the normal period of service”, we recommend adding a sentence such as “External letters that do not evaluate the work as if it were done in the normal period of service will be discounted.” Also, please see Section 3.B below.

C. Selection of External Reviewers (Sections B.1.a and B.2.b)

In Section B.1.a, we recommend giving candidates three (3) business days to respond to the list of potential external reviewers sent by the chair or dean. Likewise, in Section B.2.b, after “Concerns about any reviewers on the list may be expressed to the department chair”, please add “within three (3) business days of receiving the list.”

D. Access of the Candidate to the Promotion Case (Sections B.1.b and B.2.c)

In the University Guidelines, Section B.3 says “a faculty member may request and would then be allowed to inspect any material in his/her promotion dossier at any time during the promotion process.” Yet, the most common complaint in CCAFR appeals over the last six years is the claim that the candidate did not get full access to his/her promotion dossier. In many cases, administrative staff and administrative faculty discouraged the candidate from full access to his/her promotion dossier because they quote Section B.1.b or B.2.b without realizing what is in Section B.3. Below, we recommend changes to Sections B.1.b and B.2.b.

In Section B.1.b, we recommend replacing the text “Before the departmental committee considers a case, the chair or dean shall ask the candidate to check the materials in the promotion dossier except for the internal and external peer reviews of teaching, scholarship, and service”, with the following:

Prior to review by any departmental committee, the chair or dean shall ask the candidate to check that the contents of the promotion dossier, specifically materials provided by the candidate, are complete and up-to-date. It is the responsibility of the chair or dean to ensure that all external letters that have been received are included in the promotion dossier. As per Section B.3, the candidate has access to any of the promotion case at any time.

We also recommend using the above text in place of “The candidate should check all the materials in the promotion dossier except for the internal and external peer reviews of teaching, scholarship, and service before the departmental committee considers a case” in Section B.2.c.

E. Perceived Conflict of Interest (Section B.4)

We recommend adding “recusing him/herself from the case and” after “is responsible for” in “is responsible for absenting him/herself from the room during the review and discussion of, and vote on, that candidate”. Immediately thereafter, we recommend adding “The person recusing him/herself is not eligible to vote, and hence, he/she cannot cast or be considered as casting a vote of “abstain”.”

F. Reconsideration (Section D.4)

We recommend expanding this section. In previous CCAFR investigations, the following questions concerning reconsideration by a Budget Council or Executive Committee emerged:

1. How are “new materials” evaluated?
2. How are materials from the former case 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 evaluation of research and scholarship?
6. How do budget council evaluators conduct their review, including standards used?

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

CCAFR is concerned with many other open issues affecting academic freedom in research, teaching and expression, as well as its safeguards of tenure, due process, and faculty governance, including but

not limited to the following.

A. *Mentoring*

Effective mentoring of assistant professors and associate professors remains a difficult, systemic challenge at all levels of the University organization. We would recommend that each assistant professor and associate professor have a non-administrative faculty mentor in his/her department and a non-administrative faculty mentor outside his/her college/school. In addition, each assistant and associate professor should also consult with his/her department chair on procedures, policies and general advice.

B. *Tenure Probationary Period*

In helping to make clear how extensions of the tenure probationary period are applied, we would like to request that the provost office provide a clear statement regarding procedures that must be followed by a faculty member when he/she requests Family and Medical Leave due to childbirth or adoption. Under what conditions and for what procedures does this “leave due to childbirth or adoption” stop the tenure clock for the faculty member? We would further request that this statement be communicated to department chairs and deans so that they can provide this statement to a faculty member as soon as he/she informs their department chair or dean of the need to take leave. This will help everyone to follow formally recognized procedures to support family friendly policies.

The University already recognizes extensions to the tenure probationary clock for leaves of absence and for certain personal circumstances in HOP 2-2020. In a previous case, President Powers agreed that the University should 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. However, that exception has not yet found its way into University policies.

C. *College Promotion and Tenure Committees*

There may be a lack of transparency of promotion processes at the college/school level, including how college tenure and promotion committee members are chosen, how members of the same department on the college Tenure and Promotion Committee (T&P) give input on a case, and how the dean is involved in college/school T&P meetings and other processes. We would recommend that each college/school make this information available to its faculty each year.

D. *Evaluating Scholarship*

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

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

E. *Mid-Probationary Period Review*

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

When the faculty annual review process was overhauled by CCAFR, Faculty Council, Faculty Council Executive Committee, and the University administration for fall 2013, due to changes in Regents Rule 31102, the new University faculty annual review guidelines did not explicitly mention the mid-probationary review. The University administration has retained the old mid-probationary review process, which does not have many of the features of the faculty annual review process, such as an overall evaluation in one of four categories and an appeal avenue through CCAFR for allegations of procedural and/or academic freedom violations. CCAFR is already embedded in annual and comprehensive periodic reviews as well as tenure and promotion cases, and should be embedded in the process for mid-probationary period review to ensure the academic freedom safeguards of due process and faculty governance. Moreover, we recommend that the mid-probationary period review procedures be rewritten to be based on the faculty annual review process.

Brian L. Evans, chair

A-2 Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets

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

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

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

The Annual University Fund (AUF) includes income from the Permanent University Fund, which receives revenue from oil- and mineral-producing land. AUF is split 2/3 for The University of Texas System and 1/3 for the Texas A&M University System, with UT Austin receiving about 30% [4]. For 2014-15 budget sources, UT Austin received 8% from AUF recurring plus 2% as a non-recurring supplement with half for the Medical School [4].

In 2014-15, UT Austin earned \$562M in research contracts and grants, \$109M in other external revenue directly for an academic purpose, and \$417M in self-supporting revenue (which included \$146M from athletics and \$86M from housing/food). [4]

The recurring cost for the new Medical School increased from \$17M from 2013-14 to \$26.5M in 2014-15 [8]. The Medical School is expecting its first class in fall 2016.

The two largest expenditures in the 2014-15 operating budget are salaries and benefits (\$1.348B; 51%) and maintenance and operation (\$536M; 20%) [4]. The academic core expenditures (\$1.349B) included \$805M in salaries and benefits. Of these \$805M in salaries and benefits, the cost of faculty salaries (\$273M) is about the same as that of staff salaries (\$276M) [4]. In fall 2014, UT Austin had 3,071 teaching faculty [5] of which 63.3% are tenured/tenure-track faculty [6], and more than 16,000 staff [7].

The academic core projected budget from 2014-15 to 2018-19 shows net available funds of \$50.7M in 2014-15, and annual net losses thereafter of \$20.9M, \$20.4M, \$49.9M and \$41.1M, respectively. The

forecast projects recurring decline in tuition income in absolute dollars, and a 7.5% average annual increase in AUF recurring income. Net available funds in 2014-15 were primarily allocated for academic program initiatives (\$30M). [4]

UT Austin is facing difficult decisions to balance budgets in the face of anticipated deficits while fulfilling its increasing commitments to undergraduate, professional and graduate education. At the same time, UT Austin is in need to replace aging buildings and IT infrastructure, which comes with its own recurring cost.

The President's Office launched an effort in Spring 2013 to increase productivity in university business operations known today as Transforming UT. Transforming UT has four components: administrative systems modernization, asset utilization, shared services and technology commercialization. All four have potential cost savings.

In 2013-2014, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets met with the Central Budget Office, including CFO Kevin Hegarty and VP Mary Knight, to discuss the Transforming UT initiative. Shared Services is an on-going effort to centralize business functions at selected colleges/schools or within an upper administrator's portfolio. The intent was to gain efficiency and increase career path opportunities within UT Austin. No outsourcing was planned. Mr. Hegarty and Ms. Knight accepted our suggestion to separate the expected cost savings of Shared Services from that of the Administrative Systems Modernization Program (ASMP). (Shared Services and ASMP were coupled into the same program in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.) Our committee also met with Senior VP Dan Slesnick to learn about the university budget and budgeting processes. [9]

For 2014-15, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets focused much of its efforts on the Administrative Systems Modernization Program (ASMP), esp. on how it would affect faculty members. The committee met with Ms. Renee Wallace, Associate VP ASMP, on Nov. 24th. ASMP 2.0 is "a set of projects aimed at modernizing our administrative systems, business processes, data management, and technical architecture." [10] With the aging university mainframe being phased out by 2020, ASMP 2.0 has chosen to adopt cloud-based, distributed, and mobile-friendly frameworks for back office functions, including Workday for HR/Payroll and Finance. Workday is intended to manage contracts and grants after they have been awarded, and has been adopted by many public and private universities in the US. The committee made the following suggestions:

- Create an electronic idea box for university apps and software
- Create a faculty focus group on issues related to purchasing
 - Representatives from research centers with large annual expenditures
 - Representatives from music/fine arts with unusual requests
- Address purchasing issues to increase faculty productivity
 - Initiating purchases
 - Reconciling purchases after the fact

In 2014-15, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets also met on October 20th and discussed several issues. The committee would like to see an increased role of the faculty in each college and school for developing long-term directions and participating in the five-year budget planning. One possible implementation might be a Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets for each college/school that has its members elected by the faculty of that college/school. The College of Liberal Arts has such a committee, except that the committee has all of its members appointed by the Dean. The Faculty Advisory Committee also raised the following issues related to faculty productivity:

- Online faculty annual report entry is clunky and many colleges have opted out *
- The online conflict of interest forms are also difficult to use and understand
- Many colleges/schools are reducing their budgets for teaching assistantships
- Tenured/tenure-track positions to be reduced in College of Liberal Arts via attrition %
- Cluster hiring of senior faculty allocated to five of the 18 colleges/schools &

- Destination of funds raised during the \$3B Capital Campaign [2]
- Status of Shared Services pilot programs in College of Education and Provost Office @

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

% The College of Liberal Arts has 492 of the 1805 tenured/tenure-track faculty at UT Austin in 2014-15 [12]. Up to 80 tenured/tenure-track positions will be discontinued.

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

@ In fall 2014, College of Education scaled back its participation Shared Services and allowed each academic unit in the college to decide on their own to participate or not.

For completeness, here is a very brief summary of the questions in the 2013-14 annual report for the Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets [9]:

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

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

References

[1] *Changing the World*, p. 7, Nov.-Dec., 2012, <http://issuu.com/utaustin/docs/changing-the-world-nov-dec-2012/7>.

[2] "The Campaign for Texas", p. 2, http://giving.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/15-UD-XX-007_DEV_Board_Fall_Infographic2.pdf

[3] "Funding Then and Now", <https://giving.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Bevo-Chart-2014-15.pdf>

[4] Dan Slesnick, "A Primer on The University Budget Fiscal Year 2014-15", <http://www.utexas.edu/provost/planning/naaw/pdf/17-University%20Budget.pdf>.

[5] "Facts & Figures", <http://www.utexas.edu/about/facts-and-figures>

[6] "Faculty Characteristics", *Statistical Handbook*, UT Austin, Fall 2014, https://sp.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/rpt/Documents/IMA_FS_FacultyChar_2014_Fall.pdf

[7] <http://staffcouncil.utexas.edu/>

[8] "Budgeted Expenditures by Dean/Vice president Units and Departments", *Statistical Handbook*, UT Austin, Fall 2014, https://sp.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/rpt/Documents/IMA_F_BudgetExpDeanVP_2014_FY.pdf.

[9] "2013-2014 Annual Report A-2 Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets", <http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2013-2014/reports/standcom/a2.html>

[10] <https://www.utexas.edu/asmp/about>

[11] <https://www.utexas.edu/transforming-ut/shared-services/messages/december-2014-shared-services-update>

[12] “Full-Time Equivalent Faculty By College and Tenure Status”, *Statistical Handbook*, UT Austin, Fall 2014, https://sp.austin.utexas.edu/sites/ut/rpt/Documents/IMA_FS_FTEFacColTen_2014_AY.pdf

Brian L. Evans, chair

A-3 Faculty Committee on Committees

1. Madeline Sutherland-Meier was selected as chair elect for 2015-16.
2. On September 28, 2014, the Committee on Committees voted to recommend approval of the proposal from the Committee on Recruitment and Retention to change its function, with minor suggestions for additional language in the charge.
3. On October 13, 2014, the Committee on Committees reviewed and voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal from the Student Life and Activities Committee to divide into two committees, one focusing on athletics.
4. The Committee on Committees reviewed and negotiated changes to the requested revision of the mission statement for the Faculty Building Advisory Committee (FBAC). On October 31, 2014, the Committee on Committees voted to approval a final revised version of the proposal to revise the FBAC charge, which went to the Faculty Council on November 17, 2014.
5. On April 3, 2015, the Committee on Committees voted to recommend approval of a final version of the proposal to split the Student Life and Activities Committee into two committees.
6. The committee reviewed nominations by the general faculty for standing committee membership with attention to representation from all colleges and schools and to issues of gender and racial diversity, as well as University regulations and operating procedures. Identified faculty members were recommended to the president to serve on eighteen standing committees.

As chair, I particularly wish to thank Ms. Debbie Roberts and Ms. Victoria Cervantes for their help in organizing meetings, alerting us to needed actions, and for providing information on University regulations, by-laws etc. I could not have functioned without them.

Jill Marshall, chair

A-4 Faculty Grievance Committee

There were no formal grievances filed with the Faculty Grievance Committee during the academic year 2014-15.

The Faculty Grievance Committee chair did receive a number of emails from faculty members inquiring about grievance policies and procedures. On two occasions, the chair was contacted to meet directly with faculty members and discuss the grievance process with them and answer questions regarding grievance policies and procedures. In both instances, suggestion was made by the chair to discuss the case with the Faculty Ombuds, Mary Steinhardt. No further inquiry or contact was made to the chair by either of these two faculty members.

In April, the Faculty Grievance Committee met as an entire body to recap the Committee’s actions for the year and to talk directly with Mary Steinhardt about the role of the Faculty Ombuds. This was a very positive and informative meeting, and at the conclusion, it was suggested this roundtable conversation be a regular part of the Grievance Committee operations each year, if not each semester.

Janice Fischer (professor, molecular biosciences) was elected chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee for academic year 2015-16.

Paul E. Bolin, chair

A-5 Faculty Welfare Committee

The University of Texas at Austin Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) met during the fall semester and

discussed several topics of general interest that we felt addressed current faculty concerns. Our goal was to identify and suggest changes or improvements to faculty welfare, retention, and recruitment that would apply to the largest number of faculty, be most beneficial to the reputation of the University while acknowledging the limitations of budget constraints.

It was agreed that one of the issues placing The University of Texas at Austin at a disadvantage in recruiting and retaining faculty is the lack of benefits available to domestic partners of current and potential future faculty members. The FWC members spent the fall semester compiling information to determine the extent of domestic partner benefits afforded to faculty by our peer institutions (<https://www.utexas.edu/reporting/publications#ut-comparison-group>). We verified that UT Austin is uniquely deficient in offering benefits to domestic partners, and the FWC suggests that these lack of perquisites present a major deterrent in attracting top faculty putting the University at a competitive disadvantage. [This data set is available by contacting Blinda McClelland (mccllland@austin.utexas.edu).]

Members of the FWC were active participants in Wellness Advisory Committee meetings as the charge for the FWC and the Wellness Advisory group from Human Resources have very similar goals concerning the quality of work life for faculty members.

Faculty Welfare Committee members served as a “mini” focus group for the Faculty Gender Equity Council Committee on Family and Health. The information provided by the FWC was an integral part of the data gathered by the Committee on Family and Health. Topics covered in this context included: child care, elder care, non-academic family leave, Employee Assistance Program (EAP) availability, dual-career couples, Pride and Equity Faculty/Staff Associations, UT Faculty Women’s Organization, choosing child care (information and recommendations for faculty), family-friendly policies for faculty, ‘Stopping the Tenure Clock’, lactation/quiet rooms, parental leave, pregnancy and parenting, employee services, well-woman exam and mammogram, gender neutral restroom location, and HealthPoint/LifeCare - Work/Life Balance Services.

Members of the FWC were also instrumental in writing the Council’s final report, which has been submitted to the provost’s office for consideration.

An ongoing focus of the committee is a review and update of the 2002 final report of the president's *ad hoc* Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Teaching Faculty ([D 2488-2493](#), chair, Judith Langlois) and the November 4, 2005, Implementation Committee on the Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty report by Dr. Hillary Hart (civil engineering and committee chair).

Blinda E. McClelland chair

A-6 General Faculty Rules and Governance Committee

The FR&G Committee met several times in the fall 2014 semester. With Secretary Neikirk’s help, we determined that The FR&G Committee is the only standing committee that reports directly to the General Faculty and not to the Faculty Council. These were the topics we addressed throughout the fall:

1. Voting rights for all qualified non-tenure-track faculty.

Last year, the committee decided that listing in the legislation all n-t-t titles was not efficient or even possible, so Dean Neikirk has suggested rewriting the policy to include criteria for selecting qualified faculty members and letting the Deans determine the list of eligible n-t-t faculty in their departments. The legislation would also name the types of committees/issues that n-t-t faculty should vote on (curricular matters, etc.).

The Committee developed a proposal to be presented to the General Faculty at the special meeting to be held Jan. 26, 2015

2. Possibility of adjusting the quorum of faculty needed for general faculty meetings.

The quorum is 15% of all voting faculty for a specially called meeting and 5% for the annual meeting. After discussion it was decided to leave these numbers as is.

3. Number of protests needed to necessitate a specially called meeting of the general faculty.

Currently if 25 protests are received from faculty to any major legislation passed by the Faculty

Council, the Secretary must call a special meeting. The committee members decided that this number is too low.

The Committee developed a proposal to be presented to the General Faculty at the special meeting to be held Jan. 26, 2015. The proposal was posted and called for changing the number 25 to a percentage of the voting faculty: 3%.

4. **Number of faculty requests needed to call a Special Meeting of the General Faculty** (25, at that time) also seemed too low.

The Committee developed a proposal to be presented to the General Faculty at the special meeting to be held Jan. 26, 2015. The proposal was posted and called for changing the number 25 to a percentage of the voting faculty: 3%.

After these proposals were discussed with and approved in principle by the Faculty Council at their Dec. 8, 2014 meeting, they were posted as legislation.

However, after a meeting with the Faculty Council Executive Committee and the President and Provost, the 1st item was pulled from the agenda. The consensus was that the voting and governance status of the Medical School faculty has not been determined yet and so a vote on voting rights would be pre-mature.

In February 2015, Chair Hart met with Sue Cox (Chair of Medical Education) and Janet Dukerich) to discuss numbers of non-tenure-track faculty coming to new Medical School. The number was under 50, but should be updated in fall 2015. Shared governance should be discussed with Dean Clay Johnston.

Hillary Hart, chair

A-7 University of Texas Press Advisory Committee

The University of Texas Press remains an integral part of The University of Texas at Austin's mission to advance and disseminate knowledge through its publications. The committee met nine times during the academic year 2014-15, including the summer, at the Press conference room. The basic format for meetings is the presence of the key staff members of the UT Press along with the committee. Editors present projects for consideration based on reader's reports that have been circulated in advance to the committee along with the table of contents and a description of the manuscript. Questions are asked of the editor by committee members, and there is a general discussion as appropriate for the project. The committee then votes. It is rare for a proposal to be rejected at this point in the process since those proposals recommended to the committee have undergone extensive review by house editors and outside reviewers. Committee members, however, have made recommendations for additional revisions and/or stipulated conditions for approval. Members of the committee are conscientious, and carefully review the materials prior to the meetings.

Major changes are on the horizon with the new UT Austin Tennis Center supplanting the Press at its site. This will necessitate the separation of the Press offices from the warehouse. The former will be relocated to the Lake Austin Centre, an office building on Lake Austin Boulevard, while the latter will be placed at the Pickle Center. The exact logistics for the committee's future meetings in 2016 will be worked out during the transition process.

Michael J. Churgin, chair

B. STUDENT SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES COMMITTEES

B-1 Committee on Financial Aid to Students

During the 2014-15 academic year, the Committee on Financial Aid to Students (B-1 committee) met to discuss financial aid priorities and policies at the University. We also provided feedback to University administrators, faculty, and students who were assessing financial aid policy. Circe Sturm (chair) and Cinthia Salinas (vice chair) served as leadership for the committee. The committee also continued its policy of working closely with administrative staff in the Office of Financial Services.

The Committee on Financial Aid to Students met six times during the school year, once during each long month of the semester sessions. This is a slight reduction in the number of times that the committee met relative to the previous year, but it was a return to what the committee had done historically. The dates for meetings included: September 18, October 24, November 17, February 5, March 30, and April 17. The official charge of the committee is to review financial aid policy, and to hear financial aid appeals related to decisions in the Office of Student Financial Services (OSFS). We also are a decision-making body in awarding the Ronald M. and Marilou Brown Endowed Scholarships. This year, we did not have any appeal to adjudicate and thus did not have a formal role in this capacity.

At our first meeting in September, the committee was provided with an overview of financial aid at UT Austin, primarily as it related to undergraduates, and also of how the process is handled in the OSFS. We discussed the committee's work from the previous year and tried to set realistic goals for the coming year. We adopted the following list of topics as items of interest for the coming year:

1. Impact of Dashboard on the equitable administration of financial aid to students.
2. Impact of four-year graduation initiative on financial aid policy.
3. Information on factors affecting the disbursement of financial aid for students studying abroad.
4. Increasing opportunities for student employment on campus,
5. Addressing graduate student funding and generating priorities, including balance between professional schools, other colleges and distribution of aid.
6. Working to generate student paid internships.
7. Eight consecutive semester limit on discretionary gift aid.
8. Gift aid distribution policy, as a whole.
9. Delays in fall aid dispersal because of changes in the University calendar, specifically summer session dates.
10. More effective communication regarding K-bar and unofficial withdrawals that require financial aid reimbursement.

Membership on the committee is made up of faculty, staff and students. We also *have ex-officio* members in the OSFS (Tom Melecki and Diane Todd Sprague), the Graduate School (Marvin Hackert) and the Office of the Dean of Students (Jaden Felix). The guidance of Tome Melecki and now Diane Todd Sprague and the staff of OSFS is critical to the working efficiency of the committee. The line of communication in this regard is critical, to keeping student and faculty members fully apprised of financial aid policies and needs on campus.

The committee specifically addressed the following issues and topics over the course of the academic year:

1. Committee reviewed overall process of financial aid administration, led by Miguel Wasielewski (Fall 2014).
2. Committee elected Cinthia Salinas as vice chair, Nigel Atkinson as chair elect, and Mike Finley as chair, beginning July 1, 2015. Circe Sturm will resign from committee as of July 1, because she has been granted research leave next year.
3. Drafted and sent letter to Kim Taylor in the Office of the Registrar regarding changing dates for summer session and its effects on financial aid distribution, that negatively impact 3,658 students. Administration not able to accommodate our request.
4. Discussed Texas Advance Program and need to coordinate FINANCIAL AID efforts with admissions office, especially as this relates to and impacts diversity.
5. Drafted letter regarding K-bar and unofficial withdrawal process. Considered options for circulating letter to faculty at large.
6. Sub-committee elected to review Ronald M. and Marilou Brown Endowed Scholarships. Awards granted to all eligible applicants who met criteria.
7. Discussed options for improving financial aid administration to students studying abroad, as well as the need for more financial aid to support summer sessions.
8. Due to recent changes in OSFS and UT administration, committee voted to recommend that our committee be consolidated with the C-1 committee on Admissions and Registration. The

committee will pursue a formal request for consolidation at the start of the fall 2015 term.

Circe D. Sturm, chair

B-2 Recreational Sports Committee

The committee was comprised of the following members:

Annjene Bunyard	administrative associate, kinesiology and health education
John R. Clarke	professor, art history
Thomas W. Dison	<i>ex officio</i> , senior associate vice president and director, recreational sports
Jonathan B. Dingwell	associate professor, kinesiology and health education
Brian F. Doherty	senior lecturer, English
Jody Jensen	professor, kinesiology and health education
Xiaofen Keating	associate professor, curriculum and instruction
Sarfraz Khurshid,	associate professor, electrical and computer engineering
Kathleen M. Mabley	director, Brand Marketing and Creative Services, Office of the President
Sarah Miller	Student Government representative, biomedical engineering
Jane E. Moore	senior administrative associate, legal affairs
Keryn E. Pasch	associate professor, kinesiology and health education
Snehal A. Shingavi	<i>chair</i> , assistant professor, English
Eli Sterbcow	Student Government representative, government
Alex Stolzberg	Sport Club Council representative, electrical engineering
Gayle M. Timmerman	<i>vice chair</i> , associate professor, nursing
Alexandra Trevino	Intramural Council representative, nutrition

September 18, 2014—Election of Vice-Chair

Introductions were made and the election for vice chair took place. Snehal Shingavi explained the duties and qualifications for the position of vice-chair. Gayle Timmerman accepted a nomination, which was seconded by Brian Doherty. Since the meeting did not achieve a quorum, votes were cast by electronic ballot. Timmerman was elected vice-chair.

Committee Overview

In Tom Dison's absence, Eric Stoutner provided an overview of Recreational Sports and the role of the Recreational Sports Committee along with a sampling of divisional highlights from 2013-14. 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 2014-15. Packets of divisional publications and related materials were distributed, including a list of divisional highlights for 2013-14.

October 28, 2014—Whitaker Fields Update

Dison offered the most current information pertaining to the Whitaker Fields and Tennis Complex renovation project, including the project's history, scope, process, anticipated timeline, and fundraising efforts. He also detailed possible options if fundraising efforts fall short.

December 2, 2014—Membership and Facility Usage Fees

The committee reviewed and supported Recreational Sports' proposed 2015-16 membership and facility use fee schedules. RecSports' membership fees have remained unchanged for six years, in spite of rising costs. Therefore, for 2015-16, RecSports recommended a five percent increase in non-primary

membership fees (sponsored memberships, children, associate memberships and community memberships), in an effort to keep pace with inflation. No increase for Faculty/Staff or retired Faculty/Staff memberships was requested. A modest increase in towel service was also recommended. The last increase in towel service was requested in 2012-13. A flat 1.64 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.

February 25, 2015—Election of Chair/Financial Presentation

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

RecSports Financial Presentation

Dison gave an overview of the concepts and philosophy upon which the Division of Recreational Sports approaches budget issues, and an explanation of how the budget process works relative to the Student Services Budget Committee (SSBC). RecSports has been experiencing budget reductions since 2003-04, and is anticipating the possibility of finding additional cuts through 2015-16. On March 4, RecSports presented their budget concerns to the SSBC, but no request for funds were made.

April 22, 2015—Updates and Wrap-up

Dison provided various miscellaneous updates, including a list of recent and upcoming events, organizational changes, and projects in which RecSports is involved, and thanked the committee for its support and efforts.

Committee Activities/Meeting Topics for the 2015-16

- Introductions and committee overview
- Election of vice-chair
- Review of divisional accomplishments from 2014-15 and goals for upcoming year
- Recreational Sports' budget updates for 2016-17
- Membership and Facility Usage Fees for 2016-17
- Updates and Announcements
- Special Topics as needed

Snehal Shingavi, chair

B-3 Student Life and Activities Committee

During the 2014-15 academic year, the B-3 Student Life and Activities Committee met five times (two of these "meetings" were conducted over email.) Other meetings between Faculty Council Executive Committee (FCEC) representatives, the faculty athletics representative (FAR), some members of Athletics Councils, the two athletic directors, and the chair of B-3 occurred without the full standing committee. The chair also met with the three leaders of student organizations, Student Government, Senate of College Councils and Graduate Student Assembly.

The entire year was spent discussing legislation started in the 2013-14 academic year. The primary objective last year was to divide the current B-3 Committee into two separate committees. At the October 31, 2014, meeting we discussed creating a more exact purpose for the committee(s). Those present who had been on B-3 previously agreed that separation into a student committee and a student athlete committee would be more beneficial to the students.

The chair of the 2013-14 committee stated in her annual report that "...committee questioned if the issues related to student athletes are sufficiently distinct from the issues of students in general to merit two separate committees, especially in the area of academics." It was concluded that they needed to be considered "...separately even though there may be some overlap on certain issues."

Our discussions in meetings followed the suggestions from the previous year's committee. Recommendations for the non-athletic student committee included 1) students should be able to use this committee as a sounding board for prospective legislation and 2) B-3 Student Life would continue to facilitate communication between students, staff and faculty as well as assist in identifying student issues.

Discussions regarding the B-3 Student Athletes and Activities Committee were 1) student athletes should have a new avenue of communication through faculty for assistance in their welfare and not rely solely on coaches and athletic administrators and 2) create a line of communication between faculty and the Student Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC). The main focus of the committee would be to increase the academic community's awareness of student athlete welfare.

The legislation prepared by the 2014-15 B-3 Student Life and Activities Committee was first proposed to go before the Faculty Council on November 17, 2014. As chair of the committee, I requested that this be delayed as I had not had the opportunity to meet with the leaders of the campus student organizations. At the rescheduled presentation (January 26, 2015, [Proposal to Restructure the Student Life and Activities Committee into Two Separate Committees with Two Separate Functions \(D 11935-11938\)](#).) it was suggested that the proposal be tabled in light of concerns from the Intercollegiate Athletics Councils and the athletics directors.

The B-3 legislation was placed on the April 13 agenda ([Revised Proposal to Restructure the Student Life and Activities Committee \(D 12174-12177\)](#).) of the Faculty Council following a special meeting with members of the FCEC, the chair of B-3, the FAR, representatives of the Intercollegiate Athletics Councils, and the athletics directors. A more detailed account of the discussion at that meeting may be found by using this link. At the end of this meeting it was decided to place the separation of the B-3 Student Life and Activities Committee on the May 6 Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Hilley was not able to attend the May 6 meeting of FC and requested that FAR Michael Clement present the legislation with any recommended amendments at that time. Full details can be found at [Revised Proposal to Restructure the Student Life and Activities Committee](#).

Martha F. Hilley, chair

C. INSTITUTIONAL POLICY OR GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES

C-1 Admissions and Registration Committee

The Committee met twice this academic year in the Office of the Director of Admissions.

The agenda for the first meeting, held September 8, 2014, included three items. First, Isabella Cunningham was voted chair elect and will assume responsibilities in 2015-16. The remaining two agenda items informed members of our committee about the basic duties, responsibilities, procedures, and pending business of the Office of Admissions and of the Office of the Registrar. Acting Director of Admissions Susan Kearns and Registrar Shelby Stanfield described their units, then answered questions and clarified points of confusion. Committee members agreed to reconvene when apprised of policy issues by Senior Vice Provost David Laude, Kearns, Stanfield, or other constituencies of the University.

The agenda for the second meeting, held April 21, 2015, was to consider a proposal regarding the admission of certain veterans. Patti Ohlendorf, vice president for legal affairs, explained the scope of the proposal and addressed questions from committee members. At present, veterans' service periods lead them to forego the Automatic Admissions Policy covered in Section 51.803 of the Texas

Education Code (TEC). Put briefly, the proposed policy will ensure that anyone serving for more than two years will be eligible for automatic admissions; it will also designate such students as “true freshmen,” not as transfer students, even if they have acquired thirty college-level credits during their time in the military. The Committee voted unanimously to endorse the proposal. David Laude then briefed the committee about admissions issues likely to emerge in the next few academic years.

Following the departure of the previous admissions director, Kedra Ishop, who was recruited by the University of Michigan last spring and left UT Austin in summer 2014, the University created a new position, vice provost and director of enrollment management, “to provide strategic and operational leadership for undergraduate admissions, financial aid, and enrollment analytics with the goal of bringing increased analytical focus and greater coordination and integration to the University’s enrollment management efforts.” This new position entails increased responsibilities as the University moves from the old model of a separate admissions office to one in line with the national trend of integrating units with complementary missions. As chair of the Admissions and Registration Committee, I was appointed to the search committee, which was co-chaired by Brent Iverson and Soncia Reagins-Lilly. With the help of search firm Witt/Kieffe, in the fall, the search committee reviewed application materials and then interviewed semifinalists over video; in the spring, search committee members held face-to-face interviews with eight applicants and then met with Senior Vice Provost David Laude to report on what members saw as the merits and shortcomings of each candidate. Committee members were invited to attend events during the campus visits of the four finalists. The University hired its first vice provost for enrollment and curriculum management: Dr. Ben Corpus, formerly vice president for student affairs and enrollment management and dean of students at Baruch College. Corpus assumed his position on June 1.

One final note: throughout the year, Suzi Deem, executive assistant to the vice provost and director of admissions, provided expert assistance to the Committee on Admissions and Registration.

Linda Ferreira-Buckley, chair

C-2 University Academic Calendar Committee

Summary

In 2014-15, the *University Academic Calendar Committee* was successful in extending the Thanksgiving holiday break by the preceding Wednesday. In the previous year, the Faculty Council approved the committee’s proposal to extend the Thanksgiving holiday break by giving the Wednesday before the holiday off. To avoid losing any instructional days, the proposal also included adding one instructional day at the end of fall semester and moving the student dead days to Tuesday and Wednesday rather than on Monday and Tuesday, with final exams to be scheduled Thursday through Wednesday. On September 15, 2014, a Special Meeting of the General Faculty was held to consider this legislation; however, there was no quorum. Following discussion of the proposal, the Faculty Council then passed this legislation by a vote of 27 to 19. On January 23, 2015, the legislation was approved by the President.

Extending the Thanksgiving Holiday by One Day

The suggestion for a fall break originally came 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 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 health services. During the academic year 2012-2013, the committee put forward major legislation to introduce such a fall break during the ninth week of classes. The legislation was approved by Faculty Council but rejected by a majority of the General Faculty in a meeting held in spring of 2013. The legislation failed due in large part to resistance from faculty in Natural Sciences and Engineering, where a fall break would have resulted in a reduction of instruction of laboratory courses by one week. However, Faculty Council and the committee remained sympathetic to the students’ concerns and also received encouragement from President Powers to continue the search for a generally acceptable solution.

Given the constraints of the academic calendar as spelled out in the *Principles for the Development of the Academic Calendar*, particularly the requirement to have at least seventy days of instruction and the constraint on when the last day of the semester can occur, the committee considered several options. It was found that starting the fall semester early, while legally allowed and logistically feasible, was undesirable as it would considerably shorten the duration of intersession between summer and fall terms, which would adversely affect instructors and students who teach/take summer classes. After much consideration within the committee and discussion on the Faculty Council, the above legislation was put forward.

The new legislation:

- Makes the Wednesday before Thanksgiving part of the Thanksgiving Break, thereby extending it by one day. This change formalizes to some extent what has become for many instructors a *de facto* off day as many students already do not attend classes on this day and instead use this day as travel day.
- Extends instruction by one day (a Monday) at the end of the semester, thus maintaining the seventy days of instruction as prescribed in the *Principles*.
- Extends the deadline for submitting grades by six hours, to 4 PM, on the last day of the final exam period.

Disbanding the C-2 University Academic Calendar Committee

As for the second major goal of the committee chair, that is to disband the committee or to turn it into an *ad hoc* committee, both the president and the chair of the Faculty Council felt that Academic Calendar Committee should remain a standing committee. The committee chair decided to bow to their wisdom.

Election of Chair Elect

By March 6, 2015, the committee voted by email poll for David Stein to become the chair elect for the 2015-16 academic year.

Johann “Hans” Hofmann, chair

C-4 Educational Policy Committee

Committee Membership:

Agarwala, Seema	2013-2016	Associate professor, biological sciences
Arledge, Jane	2013-2016	Lecturer, mathematics
Bomer, Randy	2014-2017	Professor, curriculum and instruction
Cummings, Molly	2012-2015	associate professor, integrative biology
De Lissovoy, Noah	2012-2015	assistant professor, curriculum and instruction
Ebbeler, Jennifer	2014-2017	Associate professor, classics
Glavan, James J.	2013-2016	professor, theatre and dance
Hutchison, Coleman	2014-2017	Associate professor, English
Rose, Mary	2011-2015	associate professor, sociology

Faculty Council Appointees:

Julien, Christine	2014-2015	associate professor, electrical and computer engineering
Moon, Jennifer	2014-2015	Lecturer, biology instructional office

Four Students:

Garcia, Caroline	2014-2015	Senate of College Councils representative
Sridhar, Siddharth	2013-2015	Senate of College Councils representative
Torres, Gabrielle	2014-2015	Senate of College Councils representative
Clark, Margaret	2014-2015	Graduate Student Assembly representative

Administrative Advisors (without vote):

Iverson, Brent	<i>ex officio</i>	Dean, undergraduate studies
----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------

Keller, Harrison	<i>ex officio</i>	vice provost and executive director, Center for Teaching and Learning
Fenves, Gregory	<i>ex officio</i>	provost
Stanfield, Shelby	<i>ex officio</i>	associate vice president and registrar
Consultants (without vote):		
Carpenter, Linda	<i>ex officio</i>	chair, Student Deans' Committee, associate dean, communication
Chinnock, Julia	<i>ex officio</i>	president, Academic Counselors Association, academic advising coordinator

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

**UT System proposal to post comments from course instructor surveys (CIS).* At our October meeting, we were asked to give comments on a memo produced by the Faculty Council Executive Committee. The memo was itself a response to a request for feedback from UT System on its own proposal to make publicly available (e.g., on “myEdu”) the comments given on CIS forms. EPC spoke with a clear and unanimous voice that this would constitute an improper use of the valuable feedback students provide. We also made several suggested edits to the memo.

**Follow-through on one-time-exception (OTE) changes.* At our January meeting, we re-approved a proposal passed during the 2013-2014 year that removed the requirement for a faculty signature on OTE drops. The proposed legislation also removed the requirement that students (besides freshmen) be doing poorly (*D/F*) in a course in order to use the OTE. These changes mean that policies on the OTE are in line with policies on the *Q*-drop. We also re-approved language to be added to the *General Information* catalog (GIC) that encourages students to speak with a professor before dropping a course (*Q* or OTE). Last year’s EPC had been unable to get the legislation through Faculty Council before year’s end. The legislation passed this year’s EPC and obtained Faculty Council approval in a subsequent meeting.

**Removal of in absentia fee.* EPC supported removing the \$25 fee currently charged for students to register in absentia, which they do in order to be registered to graduate (e.g., when the student is living elsewhere). The fee is an additional barrier to graduating (for some), may be perceived as an additional hassle, and can create more work for administrators who collect it. The initial proposal removed the fee for all students, but when Chair Rose presented it to the full Faculty Council at its March meeting, the Graduate School indicated that they would like time to separately study the issue in order to decide if they wished to preserve the fee for graduate students. After learning that this was indeed the preference of the Graduate School, EPC redrafted the legislation in order to remove the fee for undergraduates but maintain it for graduate students, who have additional limits on when they can register in absentia. This revised legislation passed Faculty Council at their final meeting of the year.

**Electronic communications and the honor code.* At our April meeting, we discussed the issue of online collaboration, which can occur in many forms, including students’ forming a Facebook page, sharing course information remotely, or working together via electronic means. Students note that they often do not know if a professor would oppose some of these contacts (e.g., a course Facebook page) and also that these forum can inadvertently expose students to honor code violations (e.g., a student logs into a site, only to find that someone has posted improper information, such as information regarding an exam). The student members were interested in pursuing a policy that would require faculty to lay out their own policies on electronic communication so that students could better understand what is expected of them in a given course. The students were interested in a route that would have departments develop policies for its faculty (since rules and best practices likely vary across disciplines); alternatively/in addition, students wanted the issue to be included in the provost’s yearly memo on what should go into course syllabi. We discussed the limits of rules governing syllabi

(e.g., there are no “teeth” for violations) and how challenging it would likely be to get departments to develop policies. Students were strongly encouraged to take the initiative and to speak as students about what helpful language might look like and what issues are that might come up, since they are likely to know more about forms and uses of electronic communication. It was suggested that students might draft an email that would go to faculty or meet with deans and chairs to discuss their concerns and how best to disseminate information. The EPC believed it would give the issue more weight and legitimacy if it were student-driven.

Unfinished/future business. We expect the following issues might come up during future EPC terms.

- *In-person final exams for online courses.* For reasons of test security and academic integrity, there is more and more desire among those teaching online courses—both synchronous and asynchronous—to hold in-person finals. Unfortunately because online courses do not have a physical location in which they meet during the term, it is difficult to find facilities during finals weeks to devote to these courses, especially if they are large in size. The registrar’s office has managed this issue on an ad hoc basis as best as it has been able to. However, Registrar Shelby Stanfield foresees a time when it will not be possible to meet demand. He proposed allowing the use of the second “dead day” as the default exam day for online courses, and put proposed GIC language before EPC to make this change. EPC did not support using a dead day for this purpose, especially because the study period in fall will be more truncated once we start ending the term on the Monday after what is currently semester’s end. However, the issue does need to be addressed, and EPC encourages more innovation in this area, including building/renting a dedicated testing center or finding other low-use times during finals that could be dedicated to these courses. We expect this issue will come back before EPC in the future.
- *Faculty dissent from outcomes in Student Judicial Services (SJS) cases.* We briefly discussed an unusual situation in which a faculty member reported a student for misconduct to SJS and, for reasons that were not fully clear to the faculty member in question, SJS appeared to reverse itself (or at least change the conclusion that had been initially communicated to the faculty member) and decided there had not been an academic integrity violation. The faculty member felt there was good evidence of the violation (which is why it was reported to SJS) and therefore disagreed with the result. This can happen on occasion, but in this instance, the faculty member was additionally asked by the faculty’s dean to change the student’s grade to omit the zero the faculty had assigned in response to the perceived violation. EPC felt strongly that faculty should never be asked to change a grade when they feel it is not appropriate to do so. However, the larger issue this case raised was the recognition that current GIC rules (available in Appendix C in the GIC) have no formal means for faculty to dissent from an SJS finding of no academic dishonesty. The faculty member in the case discussed would have welcomed a way to convey that he disagreed with SJS findings. EPC members felt that this would be beneficial so that the record in the case would accurately reflect the different perspectives on the case, particularly if the student turned out to be a repeat-offender. Potentially, this is an issue to discuss and pursue with other Faculty Council committees on academic freedom and possibly the Faculty Welfare Committee.
- *Guns in classrooms and on campus.* During the April meeting, the fate of the legislation before the Texas House and Senate concerning so-called “Campus Carry” rules were unclear. As of the writing of this annual report, the legislation has passed and President-designate Fenves informed the campus that his office is working on campus policies that would be consistent with the new law. We expect that there will be multiple ways in which EPC might be involved in these discussions and considerations.

At our February meeting, Randy Bomer graciously agreed to be chair elect, and Seema Agarwala agreed to be the vice chair (an office we have not had filled on EPC in several years, but which would greatly assist Professor Bomer in managing EPC business). This is Chair Mary Rose’s final year on EPC after three years as chair and five years as a member. She wishes to formally thank all members for their hard work and diligence this year. It has been an excellent committee on which to serve.

Mary Rose, chair

C-5 Faculty Building Advisory Committee

The Faculty Building Advisory Committee (FBAC) met three times—twice in the fall, once in the spring—during the 2014-15 academic year. This was the first year operating under its new mission statement, a change brought about by the emergence of the Campus Master Plan Committee as the principal faculty forum for technical building reviews on campus.

The two substantive meetings of the FBAC—the September meeting was purely organizational—focused on means by which the committee could elicit broader campus views and concerns pertaining to facility planning and usage. A number of proposals were considered. The use of surveys was ultimately rejected in favor of more focused “town hall” approach. The committee agreed to target the use of student spaces in academic buildings for the first such forum. It is hoped that this can be implemented this coming fall (2015).

In addition to the discussions related to input gathering from campus the FBAC was briefed by the chair of the Campus Master Plan Committee on the various projects that came before the committee during the 2014-15 year, including the Speedway renovation.

Efforts to elect a new chair for the 2015-16 academic year failed for lack of nominees. By agreement with the Faculty Council Executive Committee, this election will take place at the September 14 organizational meeting.

Brian E. Roberts, chair

C-6 International Programs and Studies Committee

Our committee considered five matters this academic year:

1. Supporting and developing work-abroad programs and internships
2. Identifying faculty advocates for study abroad and setting up primary contact people for each college
3. A recommendation on internationalization for the presidential search
4. Supporting faculty-led summer programs
5. Recommending changes to the composition of the committee

The summarization of the decisions and findings regarding these matters are below:

Agenda item #1: Supporting and developing work-abroad programs and internships

Summary: The committee discussed the availability of work-abroad programs and internships as an alternative means for students to engage in an international experience. Students have expressed desire for more of these programs and for accessible information about them. Such programs are identifiable on the Internet. The Study Abroad Office does not advertise or develop these kinds of programs, but they advise UT Austin students to investigate carefully the credentials of the sponsoring company or program.

Agenda item #2: Identifying faculty advocates for study abroad and setting up primary contact people for each college

Summary: The committee recommended appointing an embedded study abroad professional in each college or school at the University, or at least in the largest of these. Three colleges or schools have embedded full-time study abroad professionals. This number is down from five last year, with the elimination of study abroad professionals in the Colleges of Communication and Natural Sciences. Faculty points of contact might also be established in each school by identifying approachable and knowledgeable faculty who are willing to serve as resources to students who seek information about study abroad opportunities in their respective disciplines.

Agenda item #3: Recommendation on internationalization for the presidential search

Summary: The committee identified a need for the presidential candidates to articulate a clear vision of UT Austin's global presence and the roles of study abroad, international programs, and international students in that context. The committee prepared a statement and related questions to bring to the open meetings with the finalists.

Agenda item #4: Supporting faculty-led summer programs

Summary: The committee affirmed its support for faculty-led programs and questioned the consequences of the University's decision to eliminate summer incentive plans, which may result in decreased summer enrollments and extended time to degree. A statistical analysis prepared by the International Office (Appendix A) reveals that overall student participation in study abroad programs of all types is increasing (3031 total students in 2014, the most recent year for which complete numbers exist). The number of faculty-led programs has remained at similar levels over the past three years and projections for 2016 are in line with these levels. The number of affiliated programs is decreasing, and there is administrative interest in increasing the number of students who participate in semester-long programs, including the semester-plus option.

Agenda item #5: Recommending changes to the composition of the committee

Summary: The committee debated a change in the membership of the International Programs and Studies Committee (C-6) that would include membership from every college or school. The Faculty Council advised the committee to reconsider this issue in the fall semester of 2015.

Cory A. Reed, chair

C-7 University of Texas Libraries Committee

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

The committee focused on three main topics this year: administration and budget, facilities and collections, and IT and infrastructure.

Administration and budget. The committee welcomed Dr. Lorraine J. Haricombe as the new vice provost and director of the University of Texas Libraries. Dr. Haricombe reported on her ongoing efforts to elevate the Libraries' status as a pioneer and catalyst for change in higher education that requires additional budgetary resources. The UT Libraries budget has been essentially flat for several years, and is somewhat lower this year, while the price of scholarly communications continues to inflate.

Facilities and collections. The committee was apprised of several ongoing changes in facilities and collections. First, the Dell Medical School library is in its planning stages. Second, current facilities are being improved, and new facilities on the main campus are being constructed. *Engineering:* Groundbreaking commenced on the engineering building that will include space for a re-imagined engineering library presence. *Architecture:* Work continues on fundraising for the Architecture Library/Battle Hall renovation project. *PCL:* Work has commenced on construction of the PCL Learning Commons that will include a media lab, consultation rooms, the Undergraduate Writing Center, and classes offered by University Libraries' staff; this space is expected to open in August 2015. One committee member participated in a charrette used to assess these plans. *Fine Arts Library:* The University Libraries has written a grant proposal seeking funds to develop a Creativity Commons at the Fine Arts Library. *Collections:* UT Libraries is participating in developing a Collections Master Plan for storage and access to materials held at UT Libraries, the Briscoe Center for American History, and the Ransom Center. Funding has been approved for a third storage module at the University's Pickle Campus, and the planning group is working to determine the specific parameter for this module, as well as future needs for fourth and fifth modules.

IT and infrastructure. The Committee was apprised of the UT Libraries IT infrastructure and plans.

IT infrastructure included the Fine Arts Library's streaming video service, digital media lab, and a planned UT Creativity Commons; participation in various global digital archives initiatives; and the UT Digital Repository that represents one open access strategy for making the results of academic research accessible. In addition, the committee heard about other open access strategies and their relationship to copyright issues in higher education. The committee also heard about plans to make archive materials available digitally. At its last meeting, committee members discussed potential priorities for committee attention in 2015-16, among them:

- Continued visits to branch libraries;
- Consultation with University Libraries staff on data mining capabilities;
- Request for continuing information about library services proposed for the Dell Medical School;
- Updates on the Engineering Education and Research Center and the Engineering Library;
- Continuing to develop working relationships with new members of the University administration.

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

Loriene Roy, chair

C-8 Parking and Traffic Appeals Panel

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 the 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 two to three week period. The individual panelists use their UT EID 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 chairperson of the committee 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 530 cases. Of the 530 cases reviewed, the following percentages recognize the committee's overall panel review outcomes.

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----------|
| • Denied—Citation upheld | 85.66% | 454 cases |
| • Fine reduced | 11.51% | 61 cases |
| • Warning | 00.94% | 5 cases |
| • Upheld—Citation dismissed | 1.89% | 10 cases |

The committee chairperson, Michelle Habeck, will hold an election for a new committee chair for the 2015-16 academic year at the first annual meeting in fall 2015.

The committee chairperson 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 Margaret Rogers, Matthew Enos, Paul Muscato, and Amanda Harkrider in the operation of the committee.

Michelle Habeck, chair

C-9 Transportation Policies Committee

The Transportation Policies Committee met three times during the 2014-15 academic year. The general organizational meeting provided an overview of the committee's charge and parking policies. The second meeting continued the orientation to the policies and regulations. During this meeting, we made several minor changes to policies on parking permits for campus vendors. For our final meeting, we spent a considerable amount of time studying and discussing the Committee on Parking Strategies report. We endorsed the report and the parking principles contained therein. Finally, various committee members were involved in the presentation of the study and recommendations to the University community in several meetings on campus.

Patricia A. Somers, chair

C-10 Recruitment and Retention Committee

I was conscripted, not volunteered, into the position of co-chair of Recruitment and Retention Committee. When Llewellyn K. Rabenberg could no longer serve on the committee this year, I became chair. Given the reconfigured role of the committee as set out by Professor Rabenberg's 2013-14 annual report, the committee functioned "to review University activities, programs, and initiatives, which affect recruitment and retention of minority and disadvantaged students, and to advise the Faculty Council and the president of significant findings and of any actionable items." This is a large task.

In October 2014, I met with committee member Assistant Dean Sue Harkins who discussed with me the various initiatives that the University offers, including: Project Advance, TIP Scholars, University Leadership Network, Gateway, Longhorn Link, Summer Bridge, Discovery Scholars, and FIGS.

Otherwise, the committee was inactive.

Simone A. Browne, chair

C-11 Research Policy Committee

The Research Policy Committee (RPC) held one meeting this academic year, on Sept. 8, 2014. The meeting was well attended, with approximately ten to twelve members present. Jonathan Dingwell was elected chair, with the group present deciding to determine a vice-chair at a later date. The group discussed several issues to consider working on for the year. Some of these extended discussions from the previous year(s). Topics discussed included:

1. **Data Accessibility & Management:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) now requires "data management plans" to be submitted with grant proposals. National Institute of Health (NIH) and other federal agencies have similar policies for some types of grants also. Several journals and/or publishers (e.g., Public Library of Science (PLOS)) are now also starting to require authors to make their data available as a condition of publication. UT Austin's Texas Advance Computing Center (TACC) maintains digital repository resources for long-term "static" archiving of data. TACC can also support maintaining "evolving" data architectures that may need to be updated over time. The discussion evolved around determining if TACC had the facilities and support needed if a large number of faculty started moving towards such data archiving as a standard practice and also the extent to which faculty are aware of these new/evolving federal policies on data management and availability, are aware of resources that may be available to them to assist them in complying with these policies, and what University wide policies UT has established, and/or may wish to establish to both assure that faculty can comply with these policies and to assist faculty in maintaining compliance, etc.
2. **Administrative Burdens on Faculty for Conducting Research:** This discussion extended discussions from the prior year with Susan Sedwick from Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) regarding revised / updated federal guidelines on the topic of administrative burdens placed on faculty to execute grants. Discussion regarded the NSF's request for information on "Reducing

Investigator’s [sic] Administrative Workload for Federally Funded Research.” A representative from Dr. Sedwick’s office mentioned that surveys have shown that investigators spend up to 42% of the “research” time dealing with administrative tasks not related to the conduct of the research itself. Discussion involved how the committee might assist in identifying ways to better identify more precisely where/how this time is spent, and how the University might help in reducing the administrative burden to faculty conducting research.

3. Authorship: This discussion also extended some discussion begun the previous year. One of the most common conflicts that can arise between faculty members and/or between faculty and the students/postdocs who work under them are issues related to authorship of publications. The question was raised as to whether the University should provide guidelines to faculty, research staff, and/or students with regard to authorship. This becomes difficult on a university basis because norms and standard vary quite widely across different academic disciplines. Discussion involved determining if there were ways the RPC and/or other administrative entities within the University could help better inform colleges and departments about established authorship and/or publication standards within their academic areas. However, due to scheduling and other conflicts, no further meetings of the RPC committee were held. The committee hopes to reconvene and will endeavor to address these and other relevant issues in the coming year.

Jonathan B. Dingwell, chair

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

The proposal to develop a Graduate Student Bill of Rights remained on the table but no final action was taken. This remains the major agenda item for the academic year 2015-16. As this is being written, Professor Sheldon Ekland-Olson has tendered his resignation from this committee due to a leave he will take during the fall 2015. The chair elect remains open.

Sheldon Ekland-Olson, chair

C-13 Information Technology Committee

The committee met in September, October, November, December, February, March, April and May. The topics considered are listed below. Betsy Greenberg served as chair, Tasha Beretvas served as vice—chair, and Joan Hughes was selected as chair—elect.

The committee endorsed recommendations on Student Broadband Access, Changes to University Network Infrastructure, Calendaring and Email Strategy, Toopher Adoption, Educational Technology Roadmap Updates, and UT/UT System Security Policy.

September 8, 2014

- Introductions
- Setting of meeting dates
- Discussion of possible topics

October 6, 2014

- IT Governance Overview (Brad Englert)
- 2014-2015 C-13 Committee Priority Issues (Committee Discussion)
- Educational Technology Governance—in association with the Center for Teaching and Learning (Harrison Keller)
- Student Broadband Access (William Green) <http://www.utexas.edu/its/network/>

November 3, 2014

- IT Governance Accountability Report (Brad Englert)
[https://www.utexas.edu/sites/default/files/files/2013-2014 IT Governance Accountability Report FINAL—1.pdf](https://www.utexas.edu/sites/default/files/files/2013-2014%20IT%20Governance%20Accountability%20Report%20FINAL%201.pdf)
- Technology Enhanced Education (Gloria Quesada, Emily Cicchini, Ken Tothoro)

- Canvas Learning Management System Adoption and Implementation (Dave Moss, Mario Guerra)
- <https://www.utexas.edu/its/canvas—project/>

December 1, 2014

- Campus Technology Survey (Emily Cicchini)
- Changes to University Network Infrastructure (William Green)
- Educational Technology: Studio Code (Ian)

February 2, 2015

- Calendaring and Email Strategy (Sandra Germentis)
- Toopher Adoption (C.W. Belcher) <http://www.utexas.edu/its/two—factor/>

March 2, 2015

- Educational Technology Roadmap Updates (Brad Englert)
- Digital Preservation Network (Brad Englert)
- Longhorn Innovation Fund for Technology (Brad Englert)
<https://www.utexas.edu/cio/itgovernance/lift>

April 6, 2016

- The Institute for Transformational Learning (Steve Mintz)
<http://www.utsystem.edu/offices/institute—transformational—learning>

May 4, 2016

- Learning Analytics (Phil Long)
- UT/UT System Security Policy Input (Cam Beasley)

Prepared by Betsy Greenberg with assistance from Angela Newell

Betsy S. Greenberg, chair

C-14 Technology-Enhanced Education Oversight Committee

Executive Summary

This is the annual report for the Technology-Enhanced Education Oversight Committee for the academic year 2014-15. In addition to the detailed recommendations contained in this report, the committee also received two issues to consider near the end of the year. The first came from Craig Chase in engineering and concerns questions regarding how to approach the use of sites for disseminating video content to students when those sites may generate revenue for the instructor in one way or another. The second issue came from David Vanden Bout in natural sciences and concerns the more general question of the use of instructional technologies that require students to pay an additional fee. Initial discussions within the committee point to the need to draw parallels between or differentiators from the notion of textbooks. These two issues will be revisited by the committee at the initiation of the 2015-16 academic year.

Key recommendations

The committee makes four basic recommendations that can be summarized as follows:

Course Quality. Anything that can *reasonably* be considered a *course* and is “stamped” with the UT Austin brand should be under the purview of a department and its curriculum committee (or equivalent). More specifically, anything for which University credit is given should definitely be under the purview of such a body.

Use Rights Arrangements. A default “license” agreement should be in place with a variety of options and associated default selections that can be tailored to particular circumstances.

Revenue. Embedded within more traditional license agreement is a default arrangement for the

disbursement of revenue from any program that relies on the material.

Guidance. An easy-to-use and online tutorial (flow chart) should exist to guide interested faculty through the process of initiating endeavors in the “technology enhanced education” space. This has not yet been drafted.

Details for the first three recommendations are provided in the following sections.

Course quality

Background. At UT Austin, each department chair is responsible for determining which courses are offered within the department (and assigns instructors to those courses). Many departments have committees in place that aid the department chair in this process (most often called the department’s “curriculum committee.” At UT Austin all authority for determining which courses get offered rests with the department chair. For the remainder of this discussion, we will therefore refer to the department chair as the arbiter of these decisions, with the understanding that, in departments where the department chair chooses to share and/or delegate this responsibility, the same process that is applied to “regular” courses is assumed to be applied to the courses in question here.

Further, the AAUP statement on academic freedom (AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure) states:

College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or 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 institution 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.

Accordingly, University instructors are free, within the above constraints on respect and appropriateness, to create and offer courses (online or otherwise) that may not be “approved” by UT Austin through the appropriate channels (i.e., the department chair), as long as the faculty member does not claim or imply that it is a UT Austin course and as long as he or she does not use any University resources to create or offer the course. Therefore, this recommendation only applies to courses that are “approved” UT Austin courses, bear the UT Austin brand, or utilize UT Austin resources for creation or delivery. A course or course materials delivered by a University faculty member that is not explicitly labeled as a UT Austin course should carry a disclaimer stating that the course is not an official University course.

Given the above, anything that can *reasonably* be considered a course and bears the UT Austin brand should be under the purview of an official curricular body at the University. Specifically, the department chair of the instructor’s department should be the end point of approval for the course.

The determination of whether a set of content and its delivery methods constitute a course is left to the discretion of the course/content creator. This will most often be the instructor, but could also be a group of instructors, a department, an academic unit, etc. If course credit is received at UT Austin or any other higher-education institution, the set of content will almost certainly be a course.

Recommendation: The policy that governs adding a course to the UT Austin curriculum should be augmented to account for courses that are offered via new mechanisms (e.g., online, as Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), as a series of self-paced modules, etc.), even if these courses are not listed in the catalog alongside the official UT Austin credit bearing courses. Specifically, all courses offered with the UT Austin brand should be approved by the appropriate department chair, and the course should follow the same review as any other course in the department.

Some courses may be created and offered but not naturally fit within the standard academic units and their curriculum committees. In such cases, when these courses bear the UT Austin brand, it is important that some University body oversees the courses and their quality.

Recommendation: A “catch-all” curriculum committee should be established to oversee these courses. *Where should this committee “live”? Who should be its members?*

There are reasonable concerns that there will be courses offered by instructors or units from UT Austin that were not intended to be UT Austin credit bearing courses. These courses may be taken by students off-campus who then later seek to transfer the courses back to UT Austin.

Recommendation: While there are circumstances in which UT Austin will have no option but to accept the transfer, if such an occurrence happens, the instructor or academic unit will be requested to place the course under the purview of the appropriate curriculum committee (or similar body). *Note: we have to be careful with the wording here. Academic freedom says we cannot **force** the faculty member to follow the above procedures if the course is not a UT Austin course...*

These recommendations should not interfere with a faculty member’s freedom (indicated in the above reference to the AAUP’s statement on academic freedom of expression) to create course materials, whether as parts of a course or as complete courses that may not bear a stamp of the UT brand.

Next Steps: These recommendations and their justification should be reviewed by the Educational Policy Committee.

Use Rights Arrangements

The existing “Grant Form” that is currently used to capture use rights of the University and instructors for content created and delivered, potentially generating revenue for the University, needs to be updated. Specifically, the existing grant form has the following disadvantages:

- The definition of “course material” is not clear.
- The grant form is not explicit about the rights that faculty retain for the authored material.
- The existing grant form does not address expiration times of materials or expectations of the content author to provide updates to the materials.
- The existing form does not sufficiently incentivize content authorship (because the negotiation requirements are potentially daunting).

Recommendation: The existing grant form should be revised to account for the variables introduced by new technology-enhanced education styles. Further, the grant form should provide multiple options to content authors in negotiating use rights, including giving the author the ability to negotiate a share of the potential revenue. It is imperative that faculty retain *ownership* of their authored course materials.

A draft of the new grant form is included as an Appendix.

Revenue

Depending on which option an instructor chooses on the grant form, the financial arrangements could be different.

Specifically, through the form, a faculty content author can accept a one-time payment for materials used by the University. In addition or instead, the faculty author can negotiate a financial arrangement with UT Austin. While such arrangements can be completely individualized, making the barrier to entry easier for potential instructors will benefit from some guidelines and common cases, as well as

context for the faculty member in understanding the entire revenue distribution process. In all cases, faculty authors always retain the right to use their own materials.

Recommendation: We should create an attachment to the grant form that describes a basic revenue distribution scheme, including a default arrangement for the instructor/author receiving a share of the revenue generated from using the developed materials in a commercial manner.

What follows is a specific example of determining the revenue distribution. In the below, **Gross Revenue** refers to the total amount of payments made by “students” (e.g., consumers of the material) for any commercial uses of the content that UT Austin undertakes. **Deductions** refers to costs incurred in delivering the material that are taken out of the Gross Revenue. **Net Revenue** is the Gross Revenue minus the Deductions. An **Investor** is an entity that provides monetary support for developing the course materials. The amount of the investment should be made clear in the description of the financial arrangement.

For technology-enhanced education delivered by UT Austin, **Deductions** are likely to include:

- The University collects an administrative fee that is a (small, roughly 3.25%) portion of the course fee charged.
- A fee per enrolled student charged by the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) for provision of CTL services (including enrollment management, advising, etc.) [*Obviously, this fee is incurred only if CTL services are employed.*]
- 20% of the Gross Revenue is used to repay any investor, until the investment is paid back
- 5% of the Gross Revenue is paid to the content author as a royalty payment (i.e., supplemental to the author’s University salary, and paid directly, not through a discretionary funds account internal to the University).

After the Deductions are subtracted from the Gross Revenue, the remaining Net Revenue is distributed to the college and/or department offering the course. The college or department is responsible for paying for the traditional costs of delivering the course, including the salaries of the instructor and teaching assistants (TA).

- Instructor salary [*This payment is different than any royalty paid to the content author, which may or may not be the same instructor.*]
- TA salary and tuition
- The remaining Net Revenue (if any) is split between the college and department that host the course. Internally, each college and department should have a clear and transparent mechanism for how these returns are used, and this should be detailed in the grant form. This could include supporting additional course development efforts, additional payments to instructors or content authors, or any other use that better the college or department.

It is possible that a commercial delivery of a course or other instructional material will involve content from multiple sources. In such cases, a determination of the percentage of the course that each set of content comprises will be in advance of any of the material being used commercially. Then when revenue comes in from the delivery, it is first split among the sets of content using these percentages; then the revenue distribution follows the same path as described above, but starting with the appropriate percentage of gross revenue.

Christine L. Julien , chair

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

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

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

any issues in the promotion package to the attention of the department chair before the department considers the case. See also item (g) next.

- g. Review of promotion materials by candidate at any time (section B.3).
At any time during the promotion process in the department, college or upper administration, a promotion candidate may informally request to see or may formally request to have copies of any or all parts of the promotion package. This is to ensure transparency in the process.
- h. Creation of a new “Additional Statements” section to allow the promotion candidate to provide statements related to the promotion process being applied in their case (section C.9).
This new section in the promotion package allows space for the promotion candidate to raise and respond to any issues of concern in the promotion package.

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

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

<https://utexas.app.box.com/s/drzd0rnh9mqx2d7c7g8uat8i3zns0ue2>

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

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

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

More information is available at

<http://www.aaup.org>

Appendix C



Faculty Council International Studies and Programs Committee

Heather Thompson
Study Abroad Director



Study Abroad Summary

	Exchange	Affiliated	Faculty Led	Maymester	Travel Registry/ISR	Non-UT	Total
AY 11/12	336	474	1118	238	280/89	61	2596
AY 12/13	407	459	1159	282	336/93	63	2799
AY 13/14	422	446	1332	309	383/80	49	3031

As reported to IIE Open Doors, a national statistical clearinghouse for international activities, UT has been ranked in the top five for over two decades.



Faculty Led Programming

College/School	# of Programs	# of Dedicated FTE
Architecture	5	0
Business (undergraduate)	8	1.5
Business (graduate)	6	1
Communication	1	0
Engineering	10	2
Fine Arts	1	0
Law	0	2
Liberal Arts	10	0
Natural Sciences	3	2
Public Affairs	3	0
International Office	38	7
TOTAL:	84	15.5

These totals are estimates for AY 15/16.



International Office Supported FL Programming

College/School	# of Programs	# of Students Projected AY 15/16
BFP	2	80
DDCE	1	55
Communication	8	90
Education	4	60
Engineering	3	40
Fine Arts	2	45
Liberal Arts	13	335
Natural Sciences	1	30
Nursing	1	25
Social Work	3	65
TOTAL:	38	825+

Does not include internship programs.



Hub Activity

Shanghai, China

- ❖ Exchange: Fudan and Shanghai Jiao Tong U. (new)
- ❖ Faculty Led: Government
- ❖ Internships: all disciplines
- ❖ Affiliates: language acquisition
- ❖ Basketball November 2015 – UT Acad. Delegation

Mexico City, Mexico

- Exchange: Ibero, Tec, UNAM, ITAM, CIESAS, CIDE (re-engagement)
- Faculty Led: MALS, Spanish
- Internships: all disciplines

Sharjah, UAE

- Exchange: American University of Sharjah (new)

At all of these sites the International office is also exploring inbound mobility for foreign students either as degree seeking or short term customized programs.