

## DOCUMENTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES  
OF THE GENERAL FACULTY FOR 2011-2012

The annual reports of the standing committees of the General Faculty for 2011-2012 received to date are reproduced below.



Sue Alexander Greninger, Secretary  
General Faculty and Faculty Council

## A. FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEES

### A-1 Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

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

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

In 2011-12, the work of CCAFR can be divided into four separate subjects, and each subject is described in a separate section in this document:

1. revision of University guidelines for tenure and promotion,
2. revision of University guidelines for post-tenure review,
3. three investigations of claims of procedural irregularities in tenure and promotion cases, and
4. an investigation of a claim of an academic freedom violation in removal of an instructor from a course.

#### 1. Revision of University Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

The University administration, due in part to ongoing discussions with CCAFR since at least 2008-09, has been strengthening internal regulations for providing internal review of claims that violations of academic freedom tainted promotion and tenure decisions. In particular, the wording in the fall 2010, fall 2011, and fall 2012 versions of the University's *General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* has each successively strengthened this internal review process. The fall 2012 version, which is described next, is available online at <http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/>.

The fall 2012 version of the *General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* is a significant reorganization and update. This version brings information concerning tenure and promotion processes from many different documents into one place. The updated guidelines clarify a number of longstanding issues in these processes raised by CCAFR, including the following:

- a) What academic years count toward the tenure probationary period? (Section A.3b)
- b) Evaluation of an assistant professor who had the probationary period extended. (Section A.3b)

- c) Review of associate professors without tenure. (Section A.3b)
- d) Review of associate professors with tenure for early promotion. (Section A.4)
- e) Review of associate professors with tenure who have been in rank for 10+ years. (Section A.4)
- f) Review of promotion materials by candidate before department considers case, with an opportunity for candidate to seek redress of incomplete or inaccurate materials. (Section B.1b)
- g) Review of promotion materials by candidate at any time. (Section B.3)
- 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)

Issue (e) played a significant role in two appeal cases handled by CCAFR in spring 2012, as described in Section 3 below. The impact of the changes to the fall 2012 version of the *General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* on filing requests with CCAFR concerning allegations of procedural and/or academic freedom violations is discussed in Appendix A.

## 2. Revision of University Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

In 2011, the University of Texas System Board of Regents discussed changes in the evaluation of tenured faculty members with component institutions. The UT Austin Faculty Council Executive Committee included CCAFR in these discussions. In February 2012, the Board of Regents formally adopted changes to *Regents Rule 31102 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty*:

<http://www.utsystem.edu/bor/rules/30000Series/31102.pdf>.

The changes to Regents Rule 31102 include the following:

- a. Section 5.1. Each tenured faculty member will be evaluated in writing each year in terms of research, teaching and service, and be given an overall grade of one of the following grades:
  - i. Exceeds expectations
  - ii. Meets expectations
  - iii. Does not meet expectations
  - iv. Unsatisfactory
- b. Section 5.1.g.1. The use of the overall grade in determining salary increases.
- c. Section 5.1.g.4. Two consecutive annual reviews of “Unsatisfactory” may trigger a comprehensive post-tenure review and/or employment termination proceedings.
- d. Section 5.2. Each tenured faculty member will undergo a comprehensive post-tenure review at least once every six years in writing, and the overall performance will be rated using one of the above four grades.

The new version of Regents Rule 31102 reinforces the requirement that each department provide annual reviews of each tenured faculty member in writing. (Annual reviews are also required of tenure-track faculty.) Annual feedback is particularly helpful for associate professors as they build their cases for promotion. The new version, however, erodes tenure protections.

The new February 2012 version of Regents Rule 31102 left the details of the implementation to each component institution. Throughout March, April, and May, President Powers and Provost Leslie engaged the Faculty Council, the Faculty Council Executive Committee, CCAFR, and others to discuss and draft the implementation guidelines for the University. Here are the minutes of the discussion at the April 23, 2012, meeting of the Faculty Council on this issue:

<http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2011-2012/minutes/min042312/VIII.A.html>.

Faculty Council recommendations for implementing Regents Rule 31102 can be found at [http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2011-2012/legislation/RR31102\\_guidelines.html](http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2011-2012/legislation/RR31102_guidelines.html).

These are recommendations. The provost’s office will issue the official guidelines.

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

In January 2012, three faculty members claimed procedural violations concerning tenure and promotion cases. One of them also alleged a violation of academic freedom.

Assistant Professor A had been informed of denial of tenure and promotion in December 2011. In January 2012, Professor A's department chair filed an appeal with CCAFR on behalf of Professor A to allege that the negative decision on the early tenure and promotion case was flawed by procedural errors. The first alleged error was that neither the candidate nor the department chair nor the dean knew, or was notified, that a candidate who goes up early for tenure and promotion risks losing probationary time (three years in this case) if promotion is denied. The second alleged error was use of the dean's recommendation of "Hold Without Prejudice" as outcome of the case after the dean consulted with the Presidential Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The CCAFR subcommittee recommended that the candidate be given his/her full probationary term of six years and that the University define the possible outcomes in promotion cases. President Powers concurred with all of the subcommittee recommendations. The assistant professor has received the full probationary term of six years, and the fall 2012 tenure and promotion documents now clearly define the possible outcomes in promotion cases:

[www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/rank%20recommendations%20chart.pdf](http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/rank%20recommendations%20chart.pdf)

Tenured Associate Professors Y and Z had been informed of denial of promotion to professor in December 2011. Both had been in rank for 10+ years. In evaluating associate professors in rank for 10+ years for promotion, the president's tenure and promotion memo says that the promotion "should be justified in terms of new scholarly productivity or a sustained record of teaching excellence." Professor Y's appeal points out that not only does the president's memo not give guidance on how to apply the standard, the college tenure and promotion committee did not know how to do so, either. The CCAFR subcommittee recommended that the wording in the memo be improved. Effective fall 2012, the wording has been removed.

Professor Z alleged three procedural errors and one academic freedom violation. The allegation of an academic freedom violation was that Professor Z is required to publish books in a top-tier university press for promotion, but Professor Z's primary research topic is not published by any top-tier university presses. The CCAFR subcommittee agreed that all alleged violations had merit, but that they did not rise to the level of tainting the promotion case.

The CCAFR subcommittee for Professor Z's case made several recommendations:

- (a) University should notify candidates of the promotion case outcomes in a timely manner;
- (b) faculty should receive annual performance reviews in writing;
- (c) candidate should have access to promotion materials in a timely manner before they are considered by the department; and
- (d) each college should provide guidelines in evaluating scholarship of published books.

President Powers concurred with all recommendations. Recommendations (a) and (c) have been adopted in the fall 2012 version of *General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. Regents Rule 31102 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty* changed in February 2012 to give clear guidance on how each tenured faculty member will be evaluated each year in writing, starting in 2012-13. Section 2 (above) discusses this in more detail. Recommendation (d) will take some time for colleges to address.

In evaluating the appeals filed by Associate Professors Y and Z, CCAFR noted that the tenure and promotion processes at the department level are well defined, but become less defined at the college and upper-administration levels. Here are a couple of recommendations from CCAFR:

- a. "when a college-level committee or dean decides to modify or disapprove a decision by the department, the dean should notify the department chair and candidate in a timely fashion"; and
- b. "because of the variations among the colleges/schools, each college/school should put into written form its general procedures."

#### 4. Subcommittee Report on Claim of an Academic Freedom Violation

In fall 2011, Professor X filed an appeal with CCAFR concerning his/her removal from a lecture-based course about a month into the fall 2010 semester. The removal came in the form of a letter on September 21, 2010, signed by the chair, graduate advisor, and a third faculty member in the same

department. The concerns of several students and the three faculty colleagues appear to be over content and style of Professor X's teaching of the course. There were no accusations of gross incompetence or misconduct. The September 21, 2010, letter references only "complaints serious enough to warrant a change in the direction of the course." There was no evidence of due process beyond the department prior to the issuance of the removal letter on September 21, 2010. On November 6, 2011, CCAFR concluded that removal of Professor X from the course,

- a. involved a significant violation of Professor X's academic freedom in teaching according to standards set by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and
- b. did not follow procedures clearly outlined in the *UT Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP)* 3.18 (c.f. Section I.C.3.b).

Professor X's CCAFR appeal was considered only in the context of his/her faculty grievance heard in December 2011. In the final ruling on February 10, 2012, President Powers asserted that Professor X's removal was a matter of academic management and not a matter of disciplining a faculty member, and hence, *HOP* 3.18 did not apply. AAUP issued a letter on April 23, 2012, saying that the "AAUP has long considered the suspension of a faculty member from his or her primary responsibilities as a severe sanction, regardless of its purported basis."

As part of Professor X's CCAFR appeal, CCAFR recommendations included:

- a. adding safeguards to ensure that a faculty member receives due process in the provost's office when there is an attempt to remove him/her from a course against his/her will, and
- b. improving the training of current and future department chairs on issues of academic freedom and its relevance to personnel decisions.

Brian Evans, chair

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

The Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets (FACB) met a total of 8 times in the 2011-12 long session, 6 times in fall 2011 (twice with the president and provost) and twice in spring 2012 (both times with the president and provost). At its first meeting, the committee decided to keep working on these activities from the previous year:

- Ensuring that the Faculty Council's 2010 resolution is heeded and that faculty budget advisory committees are set up at the unit level: one suggestion was for the FACB to set up a website with a scorecard tracking what each unit has done to involve faculty in its budget decisions.
- Monitoring implementation of the recommendations in the 2008 gender equity report, as well as recommendations on salary compression and salary inversion in the FACB resolution of 2009. How did these recommendations play out in merit increases this year?
- Continuing to define the role of the FACB, given that the committee has not in fact had any opportunity to "review budgets" at any level that would enable input into the budgeting process.

As the year progressed, the FACB members focused mainly on the last item, working with the president and provost to define the areas the committee would provide input to before decisions are made. At the second meeting (September 19, 2011, President Powers urged the FACB to focus on "trajectory shaping" issues that would concern the faculty. We decided to focus on these three areas not listed in order of importance):

1. Merit raises
2. Non-salary support for faculty
3. Graduate-student support

The following are the concerns the FACB uncovered, relative to each of the three areas, and actions we took or planned to take to alleviate them.

#### **1. Merit Raises**

President Powers stated that UT Austin is definitely behind our competitors in terms of faculty salaries. We are less behind in terms of staff salaries.

According to President Powers, the cost for a 2% across-the-board raise for faculty would be about

\$14,000,000. As of end of March 2012, nothing had been decided nor could be until the budget situation became clearer. Once the Board of Regents rejected UT Austin's request for a small tuition increase in April, an across-the-board raise became even less likely. The deans will therefore probably decide the criteria for individual faculty merit raises.

The president also informed the committee that budget cuts over the last 2 years have definitely eroded UT's ability to deliver services, education, and research productivity. There is a \$20,000,000 shortfall in the 2013 budget of 2.2 billion.

The administration is still working to correct problems with salary inversion and compression, a recurring task that requires constant effort.

The FACB is still concerned to monitor the recommendations in the 2008 Moore/Ritter *Gender Equity Report*, but progress has been impeded by a change of leadership in the provost's office.

## 2. Non-Salary Support for Faculty

Several meetings in fall 2011 were spent with Victoria Rodriguez to explore the reasons for shifting the awarding of FRAs, SRAs, and graduate fellowships down to the academic units and away from the Graduate School. Dean Rodriguez explained the decision as enabling UT to be more strategic and to better use its resources to support both excellent and up-and-coming academic programs.

The FACB sent a letter to all UT deans (see Appendix A) asking them to describe the process they would use to make these awards, and reminding them of the president's charge to involve their faculty in those decisions. Five deans answered the letter. Most described forming a committee with some faculty chosen by departments and some appointed by the dean. The FACB will monitor this awards program over the next couple of years to ensure that faculty are involved and feel the selection process is fair.

Another source of support for faculty is research grants. Several members of the FACB are looking into improving the productivity rate of faculty-written proposals. The Office of Sponsored Projects has many constraints and the staff are dedicated and hard-working, but it may not be operating as effectively as it could, especially in responding quickly enough to proposals, especially industry proposals, that could be used to fund research projects (and therefore students). We will continue to interview OSP staff and determine whether we have specific recommendations to bring to the President.

## 3. Graduate-student support

President Powers has told the committee that his topmost priority is building and maintaining the excellence of the faculty, and that his second is to increase graduate-student funding. We are behind our competitors in graduate-student support. Better funding/benefits for graduate students could be a recruiting tool.

The FACB identified several issues with improving funding for graduate students, along with actions to take:

- Graduate students with prestigious fellowships don't get UT benefits (because they are not employees) – this hurts us in recruiting. When we asked Provost Leslie what would be the cost for UT to pay health benefits for all fellowship holders (internal and external), his estimate was about \$2,000,000.

The committee needs more data on fellowship holders in order to make comparisons btw those with and without UT pay and benefits. We should collect information on fellowship allocations within colleges/schools. The Graduate School does not have this information but asked Dean Rodriguez to collect it from the academic units.

- The maximum *remission* for fulltime TAs is  $\frac{3}{4}$  of tuition. The units, however, get to decide exactly how the tuition-remission is allocated (some students get 100%, some less than  $\frac{3}{4}$ ). (Note: Most of our

peer institutions do not charge any tuition to TAs/AIs.) The FACB needs to discover why tuition for TAs/AIs/fellowship holders cannot simply be waived. Is there a legislative requirement involved? The committee sent a letter in February 2012 (see Appendix B) to new graduate dean, Judith Langlois, who promised to share information as soon as she was established in her position.

- Faculty cannot currently make multi-year offers to graduate students. The FACB needs to explore how to move toward the ability to make multi-year offers to graduate students.
- The Provost would like to see a push toward rewarding those graduate students who finish their degree on time. He encourages the committee to re-think the across-the-board support for all GRAs and TAs. Perhaps departments would be willing to reward more highly performing graduate students by paying them more.
- The committee will continue working with the Graduate Assembly and the Rights and Responsibilities of Graduate Students Committee (C-12) on all these issues.

At the final meeting of the FACB (May 14, 2012), President Powers shared information on the increased freshman enrollment in fall 2012. The yield rate of acceptances is up 5% this year, so we will have about 51,000 students total in 2012-13. UT typically budgets for about 49,000 enrollment, but we have been running about 51,000 for last few years. Proportionately, we have recruited more out-of-state students this year (we are allowed only 10% of undergraduates to be out-of-state).

The president is very worried about faculty salaries: other universities are recovering after the recession, often because of tuition increases, and they are coming after our faculty.

Hillary Hart, chair

### **A-3 Faculty Committee on Committees**

Having served on this committee since 2006—for the past six years—this academic year 2011-12 is the only year where the committee did not have to address CoC policy issues such as committee compositions, functions, or other responsibilities of standing committees.

Thus, at our meetings held in March and April, we only had to focus on selecting faculty members to serve on the various standing committees for the academic year 2012-13. We selected faculty representing broad faculty participation in faculty governance, with representation from all colleges/schools, faculty rank, gender, and racial diversity. We reviewed the many nominations by faculty for committee memberships and finished with a slate of faculty committee members to the president representing new committee members for the twenty-one standing committees.

Seema Agarwala was selected as chair elect for 2012-13.

Nancy Kwallek, chair

### **A-4 Faculty Grievance Committee**

There were no formal grievances filed during the academic year, and, as a result, the committee had no formal meetings throughout the academic year.

The committee chair did receive a small number of emails from a few faculty members inquiring about potential grievances. In his view, the issues raised were not yet at the level that a formal grievance procedure was warranted; he suggested attempting to work out the difficulties with the relevant administrators, and to contact the Faculty Ombuds if that would be helpful. No further contact with this committee resulted.

During the summer of 2012, the committee was informed that the president had approved that an issue involving a tenure decision of a particular faculty member could be sent to the Faculty Grievance Committee, and so the committee expects a formal grievance to be filed early in the coming academic year.

Desmond Lawler, chair

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

The Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) met five times during the academic year: September 9, October 18,

November 15, February 16, and April 30. All meetings were chaired by Professor Worthy. This report summarizes the FWC's efforts for the 2011-12 year. The committee focused on three issues during the year:

1. Protection for faculty from arbitrary reclassification of their status and duties (i.e., from "research faculty" to "teaching faculty") without due process.
2. Monitoring the rights of lecturers and other non tenure-track faculty.
3. Implementing procedures for identifying and supporting tenured faculty members who cannot perform the duties of their employment due to a permanent cognitive condition.

#### September 9, 2011

At the September 9 meeting (attended by Professors Alman, Perry, Vaaler, Warner, and Worthy), the chair reviewed the 2010-11 FWC annual report. The group agreed to focus on the issue of protection for faculty from arbitrary reclassification of their status and duties (i.e., from "research faculty" to "teaching faculty") without due process.

The committee wondered how such considerations might be tied to promotion, merit, and termination. There was general agreement that there should be a University policy in place for decisions made in regard to accountability processes and faculty appointments/tracks, that it should be transparent, that faculty should have input, and that there should be an appeal process. We decided to investigate how decisions are made about the nature of faculty appointments and how accountability processes are enacted across the University and in colleges and departments.

Alan Friedman, chair of the Faculty Council, joined us for part of the meeting, informing us that there is currently no University policy that determines the standards for faculty productivity. Colleges and departments make these decisions through executive committees. Friedman recommended we coordinate with the Committee for Academic Freedom and Responsibility, which oversees the post-tenure review process, and with the chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee as we pursue these issues.

David Warner raised the issue of faculty benefits (e.g., health care), how those decisions are made, and if there is faculty input.

#### October 18, 2011

The second meeting (attended by Professors Alman, Granoff, McCray, Perry, Rawlins, Vaaler, Warner, and Worthy) began with a discussion of how productivity is measured across the University with the conclusion that there are substantial differences across and even within departments as well as a lack of consistency and transparency. There was a general consensus that checks and balances need to be in place to protect faculty members from unwarranted and involuntary reassignment to a "teaching track," as well as more transparency about decisions regarding merit and salary increases. This discussion was mainly about the handling of tenured and tenure-track faculty. However, one tenured committee member noted, "lecturers are the most abused group on campus."

The committee was joined by Brian Evans, chair of the Committee for Academic Freedom and Responsibility. Several committee members were surprised to learn that the *Handbook of Operating Procedures* mandates that every faculty member (including lecturers) receive an annual written evaluation of teaching, service, and research. While grievance procedures are clearly available to faculty, the welfare committee members want faculty to have prospective fair warning with opportunity for remedy.

#### November 15, 2011

The third meeting (attended by Alman, Granof, Leite, Perry, Vaaler, Warner, and Worthy) continued the previous discussions of protection for faculty from arbitrary reclassification of their status and duties. We examined some of the safeguards and transparencies that, in principle, are guaranteed through section 3.17 of the *Handbook of Operating Procedures* and hope that these will be extended to other administrative decisions such as reclassification and other changes in status. Perry was delegated to draft a statement with regard to such a recommendation to the Faculty Council. The committee believes that these protections will be of increasing importance as the recommendations of the Committee of 125 are implemented in handing over more decision-making power to deans and department chairs.

Granof alerted the committee to the report of the 2002 “Langlois Committee,” which made recommendations regarding the status and welfare of non tenure-track faculty. Among other recommendations, the committee charged the Faculty Welfare Committee with working with the provost to carry out the recommendations of the report, but so far this has not been done. The committee agreed that that will be one of the main foci of the spring work of the committee.

Warner reported that he serve on the Wellness Advisory Committee, set up to advise on initiatives underway to encourage and incentivize healthy behavior, and will keep the FWC posted.

#### February 16, 2012

The third meeting (attended by Vaaler, Worthy, Westbrook, Rawlins, Perry, and Warner) focused on the issue of faculty who are unable to perform their duties due to cognitive impairment. Linda Millstone, associate vice president for institutional equity and workforce diversity, and Mary Steinhardt, faculty ombuds, presented this issue to the committee. Also attending were Brian Evans, chair of the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, and Desmond Lawler, chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee.

Linda Millstone began the meeting by describing an issue that has come up a number of times with her office as well as in the Ombuds office, that is, faculty members who are unable to perform their duties (research and/or teaching) because of permanent, chronic, and/or progressive cognitive issues caused by dementia or mental illness. Indicators can include worsening student evaluations, missing or being late to classes, and/or negative post-tenure reviews.

Administrators (deans, chairs, directors) are not trained to handle these issues and are often unaware of existing options. Procedures are inconsistent, are often punitive, and can lead to lawsuits. An expedient, fair process is needed by which these faculty members can be treated respectfully and humanely, honoring their contributions, while also ensuring students are taught by competent faculty.

Ideas for addressing these issues include getting EAP involved, appointing a faculty member or committee to oversee the issue, and communicating the range of possible solutions to administrators.

#### April 20, 2012

At the final meeting (attended by Worthy, Vaaler, Perry, Warner, Granof, and Leite), we reviewed and discussed a draft statement submitted by Perry about the issue of administrators changing faculty status without consent or due process. Consensus of the committee was that some of the concerns might have been unclear. However, there was agreement on the key issue in that there needs to be a transparent process, procedures, and implementation of procedures. The FWC will discuss the issue with members of the Faculty Council to make them aware of these concerns and to get their perspectives.

Warner presented information to the committee regarding smoking and health insurance. There will now be an extra \$30.00 per month added to the out-of-pocket cost of health insurance for smokers.

Vaaler was elected chair for the 2012-13 Faculty Welfare Committee. The committee’s major priority for the 2012-13 year will be to review and oversee implementation of the “Langlois report,” outlining policies regarding non-tenure track faculty. Worthy will work with Martha Hilley, chair-elect of the Faculty Council, to rewrite the charge of the FWC to include this issue.

Mary Jo Worthy, chair

#### **A-6 Rules and Governance Committee of the General Faculty**

The Faculty Rules and Governance Committee (FR&G) conducted most of its business via e-mail during 2011-12 and also met on February 13, 2012 and August 10, 2012. A meeting with administration to discuss voting rights legislation was also held October 19, 2011, in addition to discussion on this issue that took place during Faculty Council Executive Committee meetings throughout the academic year. Legislation relating to voting rights (D 8512-8513 and D 8563), revisions to the no-protest legislation procedure (D

9505-9509), and revisions to departmental budget council authority (D 8456-8458) was all passed by the Faculty Council, but remain pending in the Office of the President. It is likely that the voting rights legislation will require further revision and reconsideration but the Faculty Council. Legislation concerning changes in the nomination and election procedure for the secretary of the General Faculty (D 9214) was approved during 2011-12. Extensive discussions in conjunction with the Faculty Council Executive Committee continue on revisions to the proposed revisions to UT Austin's *HOP* 3.16 Threatened Faculty Retrenchment (D 8936-8939) also took place in 2011-12.

In spring 2012, the committee elected Dean Neikirk as chair elect to serve as chair during 2012-13.

Dean Neikirk, chair

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

The University of Texas Press remains an integral part of The University of Texas at Austin's mission to advance and disseminate knowledge through its publications. The committee met seven times during the two long semesters in 2011-12; the committee will meet two times during the summer. The basic format for meetings is the presence of the key staff members of the UT Press along with the committee. Editors present projects for consideration based on reader's reports that have been circulated in advance to the committee along with the table of contents and a description of the manuscript. Committee members ask questions of the editor, and there is a general discussion as appropriate for the project. The committee then votes. 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. As a general rule, the members of the committee are conscientious and carefully review the materials prior to the meetings. There is a good working relationship with the UT Press staff. The committee has no legislation to propose to the Faculty Council.

Charlotte Canning, chair

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

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

Successful operation of student financial aid involves two major components, one related to finances and the other related to service delivery. The financial component involves having sufficient funds for scholarships, grants, and loans to make a significant difference in the lives of students. The service component involves making financial aid available to students in an efficient and equitable manner. Both of these components of financial aid faced significant challenges at The University of Texas at Austin in the last two years.

The nature and amount of financial aid available to students has shrunk due to changes in state and federal programs, and providing efficient service to students has been difficult because of delays in the passage of the state budget in the spring of 2011 and other factors affecting the campus. The Committee on Student Financial Aid met six times during the 2011-12 academic year to consider these and related issues. In an effort to identify critical issues and possible solutions, the committee adopted a list of 10 prioritized goals.

##### Goals for Student Financial Aid

1. Increase the number of campus jobs for students and build offers of campus employment into financial aid offers.
2. Improve and stabilize the timetable for applications for financial aid and notifications of financial aid to enable students (and parents) to plan more effectively.
3. Develop a one-stop, central information portal for scholarships and other financial aid resources for students.
4. Make increased scholarship funds a top University priority in fund raising.
5. Increase student understanding of financial aid processes and procedures.
6. Enhance the Bevonomics training program by studying its effectiveness and increasing participation, particularly in face-to-face training situations.
7. Find ways to make financial aid more effective in promoting 4-year graduation rates.
8. Have a fixed tuition contract for a 4-year degree.
9. Create more merit-based scholarships, even if these are small.

10. Better align goals and objectives of the Office of Student Financial Services with the goals of colleges and departments in their use of scholarship dollars.

These goals are identified as a starting point for further discussion and implementation. The present report comments only on the top three goals.

The goal with the highest priority is to increase the number of campus jobs for students and to build assignment of campus employment into offers of financial aid. This addresses both the financial and service components of student financial aid. Making campus employment a part of student financial aid increases the total pool of available resources. Incorporating campus employment assignments into financial aid offers relieves students of the burden of securing employment on their own, which may take them far from campus.

Attending college is a major financial burden for students and their families. It is important to make sure that students and their families have sufficient lead time for making applications and for figuring out how to pay for an upcoming semester once they are notified of what financial aid they will receive. The second goal addresses this issue. The third goal is a response to the complexity of student financial aid resources, which include federal and state loan programs as well as scholarship and other resources controlled independently by various colleges and departments on campus. A central one-stop web portal for all of this information would be of great help to students.

Other activities of the committee included the following:

1. The committee met with Vice Provost Gretchen Ritter to discuss why the Office of Student Financial Services now reports to the Office of the Provost and how to better integrate the functions of the Office of Student Services with the various academic programs on campus. A major issue in the discussion was how to use financial aid offers as a way to attract and retain outstanding students as well as students from ethnic and minority groups and students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds.
2. The committee received and discussed a report by Director of Student Financial Services Thomas Melecki on the general status of student financial aid at The University of Texas at Austin.
3. The committee received and discussed a report by Director of Student Financial Services Thomas Melecki concerning the status of federal and state-based financial aid, what portions of those programs were terminated recently, and what portions were at risk.
4. The committee discussed with Dean Marvin Hackert changes in financial aid for graduate students and the shift of graduate fellowship programs from the School of Graduate Studies to the various colleges.
5. The committee received a report concerning the Customer Satisfaction Survey of the Office of Student Financial Services.
6. The committee discussed issues related to student financial aid that were included in the final report of the Task Force on Undergraduate Graduation Rates.
7. As in past years, in April, a subset of the committee (Chang Liu, Kelly McQuery, and Marvin Hackert) reviewed and ranked candidates for the Ronald M. and Marilou D. Brown Scholarship. The scholarship stipend for each of the top 10 candidates was set at \$1,000.

Michael Domjan, chair

## **B-2 Recreational Sports Committee**

August 31, 2011 – Election of Vice-Chair

Introductions were made and the election for vice chair took place. David Birdsong nominated Thomas Hunt, who was unanimously elected.

### *Committee Overview*

Tom Dison, *ex officio*, provided an overview of recreational sports and the role of the Recreational Sports Committee along with a sampling of divisional highlights from 2010-11. 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 2011-12. Packets of divisional publications and related materials were distributed, including a list of divisional highlights for 2010-11.

September 30, 2011 – Recreational Sports' Financial Overview, Budget Review

The committee was given an overview of the concepts and philosophy upon which the Division of Recreational Sports approaches the use and expenditure of funds, along with an overview of how the budget process works relative to the Student Services Budget Committee (SSBC). RecSports has been experiencing budget reductions since 2003-04. In 2009-10, RecSports began a concentrated period of contraction, with a total of \$800K in reductions to date and an additional \$100K in planned reductions expected by 2014-15. Dison reviewed the budget reductions RecSports had identified thus far. He explained that the 2012-13 budget request is proposing no growth items or large changes. The division will be moving forward conceptually, hoping for no additional budget reductions.

October 31, 2011 – Membership and Facility Usage Fees

The committee reviewed and supported the recreational sports 2012-13 membership and facility use fee schedules. Recreational sports did not request an increase in faculty/staff membership fees, but did suggest a small increase for towel service to accommodate an increase in contract costs and increased quality of towel. A flat 1.15 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.

December 1, 2011 – RecSports Surveys

The Division of Recreational Sports consistently conducts research and collects data in an effort to identify trends, allocate resources, and determine future directions. The data RecSports collects include usage and participation, satisfaction levels, benefits and outcomes, and demographics. The division typically schedules 6-8 assessment projects annually. Dison reviewed the recent faculty/staff survey and RecSports member survey with the committee.

February 09, 2012 – RecSports Updates

*Gregory Gym Retail*

December 1, 2011, recreational sports issued a request for proposal to the bidding community for the repurposing of the Gregory Gym Café space. Bids closed on January 5. Nike Inc. was the only respondent. An evaluation committee reviewed the Nike proposal and made a recommendation to purchasing with intent to award issued. A contract is now in process. RecSports is working with the architect to create a combination retail outlet and fitness resource center that hopes to serve as a new fitness hub for students and RecSports members. The committee viewed a slide show with some concept designs for the new space and fielded questions from the committee.

*Five-Year Plan*

RecSports submitted its updated 5-year budget plan through 2015-16 on January 31. As required by the University, the plan identifies 2 percent of applicable salaries for a possible merit pool or redistribution. The total includes funds that will be made available from the closing of the current gym store. The plan will be updated each year as required. The committee was supportive of RecSports' plan to manage costs through 2015-16.

April 05, 2012 – Election of 2012-13 Chair-Elect

The Faculty Council requested that the committee elect a chair for the following fiscal year at this meeting. David Birdsong nominated the current vice-chair, Thomas Hunt. Jane Moore seconded the nomination. No other nominations were made. A vote was called, and Hunt was unanimously elected.

April 30, 2012 – Committee Activities/Meeting Topics for 2012-13

- Introductions and committee overview
- Election of vice-chair
- Review of divisional accomplishments from 2011-12 and goals for upcoming year
- Recreational sports' budget updates for 2013-14 and 2014-15
- Membership and facility usage fees for 2013-14
- Updates and announcements
- Special topics as needed

David Birdsong, chair

### **B-3 Student Life and Activities Committee**

The Student Life and Activities Committee (B-3), created by the Faculty Council in January 2010, met five times during the 2011-12 academic year. Richard Reddick (educational administration) was elected chair of the committee and Andrew Dell'Antonio vice-chair for 2011-12 and chair elect for 2012-13.

At the first Student Life and Activities Committee (SLAC) meeting, the group considered how best to focus our attentions in the course of the year. Given the broad spectrum of responsibilities for this newly constituted committee, which include “To look at issues concerning student life and activities from an academic perspective; to gauge whether student activities are beneficial to students’ education; to review and report to the Faculty Council annually about the status of the intercollegiate athletics programs,” the consensus was that the majority of the members of B-3 did not have the expertise or background to review the status of the intercollegiate sports programs and come to any kind of meaningful evaluation. This was a sentiment shared by the 2010-11 committee; thus it seems that the Faculty Council should re-examine this charge for the SLAC. Alba Ortiz, Ted Gordon, and Jim Vick brought their considerable experiences from working with athletics to the work of the committee; however, the consensus among committee members was that to take on the responsibility of reporting on academic outcomes in athletics would more or less constitute the entire work and time of the committee. Athletics currently creates an annual report with voluminous data, which may in fact contain the information that the Faculty Council seeks.

If the Council deems that the athletics reporting aspect of the committee’s responsibilities should remain, the committee has two recommendations: 1) appoint an administrator from athletics who can serve as a facilitator of information between the committee and athletics; and 2) provide a graduate assistant who can direct the data collection and reporting aspect. Additionally, members suggested that the Athletics Council should report to the Faculty Council to avoid replication of this work. The student representatives additionally echoed the sentiments of the faculty, wishing to devote the majority of the committee’s time discussing ways to enhance and improve student experiences at the University with an emphasis on the common experience of academics and co-curricular activities.

The 2011-12 committee endorsed the recommendations of the 2010-2011 committee, which expressly focused on the enhancement of faculty-student interaction as a means to foster a sense of community among the constituents of our campus. These recommendations include:

- A summer reading program where everyone on campus reads a single book—students, faculty, administration, and staff. In the fall, a variety of activities could be organized for group discussions in different formats and venues that would allow students and faculty to interact in a low-key way while discussing ideas and responses to literature.
- Borrowing Plan II’s “Voltaire’s Coffee” concept, faculty members could select a book or film (that may or may not be related to their own field of research) and host a discussion for 20-30 students either at their homes or in a casual space such as the Student Activity Center (SAC). Students would sign up to attend; coffee and dessert could be served. These could take place throughout the year. A variation on this idea is a “Faculty Fireside,” where students sign up to come to a professor’s house for dessert and conversation on a contemporary issue.
- Reinstate faculty fellows in all of the dorms and eating halls. Here, a faculty member is a mentor for a hallway or section of a dorm and dines on a regular basis (weekly, bi-weekly, monthly) with the students. These casual lunches and dinners would allow informal conversation and discussion between students and professors to take place over the course of the academic year and relationships to develop outside of the classroom setting.
- Establish/reserve community tables in Jester, Dobie, and the SAC where students and faculty could meet on a regular basis to discuss certain topics over lunch. For example, each Tuesday a certain table in Jester Commons could be designated for current events (or economics, problems in engineering, contemporary film, etc.), and students and faculty could meet for a casual exchange of ideas.

After President Powers announced the increased focus on four-year graduation, the committee invited Vice President of Student Affairs Juan C. Gonzalez to discuss the impact of this emphasis on student life. Dr. Gonzalez discussed a number of initiatives in the Division of Student Affairs and urged the committee to dedicate attention to how four-year graduation will affect all aspects of the student experience at UT

Austin. Andrew Townsell, student government (SG) chief of staff, also visited the committee to present current concerns of the SG. Many of the concerns surrounded financial aid.

The committee invited a panel of student representatives ranging from first-years students to seniors to discuss what they considered to be the “best practices” fostering faculty-student interaction. Students universally agreed that they craved more faculty-student interaction and discussed the following ideas and initiatives:

- DWAP (dining w/a professor) – Ranging from 10-60 students. Small or large event, for those taking courses with host professors or about to take classes. Very popular.
- “GPS” (games, profs, and students) team building activities. Trivia component. Dinner.
- In engineering, regularly scheduled advisor are professors. This contact allows students to gain insight on future activities such as co-ops and graduate school. Students enumerated some of the benefits of this approach:
  - Staying connected through professional life
  - Recommendations
  - Experiences of faculty help with our career
  - Undergraduate research – what they do outside of the classroom setting
  - “Parenting”
  - “Waste of time” to come to UT and *not* have a research experience
  - Students like knowing the professors and being able to say “hi” in the halls.
- College Councils would potentially be interested in piloting a program to bring faculty in dorms and dining halls.
- Students endorsed the “Faculty Fireside Chat” idea. They also discussed the Tejas Club’s Faculty Coffees as a particularly successful way to meet and learn about the work of faculty.
- To ensure success for these ideas, students made these recommendations for SLAC:
  - Getting traction with councils – meeting with councils early in the school year to propose legislation.
  - Making participation voluntary (faculty/students). These faculty-student groups should be small and approach college deans.
  - SLAC could assist in identifying faculty who are interested in meeting with students via a portal such as EUREKA.
- Though much attention has been directed to orientation, students felt there should be more discussion on mentoring, which can also continue through FIGs.
- Jim Vick discussed the Math Club, which has met on Wednesdays for free pizza. This is funded through the College of Natural Sciences.
- Students discussed how the campus community came together – faculty, students, and staff – for the Pancakes for Parkinson’s fundraiser in the spring semester.
- FIGs are an opportunity for faculty to meet students in a safe space. Faculty speakers could visit for 30 minutes and field questions.

A number of committee members expressed concern for the workload of faculty, given the increased demands on faculty time and the reduction of FTE faculty. As inspiring and important as these efforts are, faculty are increasingly concerned with promotion and tenure as well as increasing teaching, research, and service obligations. SLAC should continue discussing this tension and potentially bring this concern to Faculty Council.

An additional and enduring concern with SLAC is the process of electing a chair and vice-chair. There is considerable confusion regarding who on the committee is eligible to serve in either capacity, and given the many obligations of faculty, it would be helpful to indicate to new members that according to their term, they are likely needed to serve as chair or vice chair, so that members are aware of this responsibility from their selection to the SLAC.

The committee found the interaction with student representatives to be among the most fulfilling and useful actions during the 2011-12 academic year. We recommend that the 2012-13 SLAC similarly forge

relationships with Student Government, Graduate Student Assembly, and the College Councils to facilitate many of the proposed ideas and learn what concerns the B-3 committee can assist with.

Richard Reddick, chair

## C. INSTITUTIONAL POLICY OR GOVERNANCE COMMITTEES

### C-1 Admissions and Registration Committee

The committee met periodically throughout the 2011-12 academic year.

At the first meeting of the year, Kedra Ishop, director of admissions, presented an overview of the criteria and deadlines of the general application process and the impact the top 10 percent rule has had on admissions to the University. Shelby Stanfield then gave a quick overview of the 15 different core functions of the Registrar's Office, involving administrative issues, which directly affect students.

As a result of suggestions made by last year's committee the Admissions Office hosted an information session specifically for UT faculty with high school juniors and seniors. The committee was informed that both sessions had been very successful and that the Admissions Office intended to hold them again next year.

During the year, the committee concerned itself with the difficulties of recording multiple majors. This is an issue of some concern especially to small departments who think that the number of their majors gets under-reported. Shelby Stanfield emphasized that the Registrar's Office regards multiple majors as simultaneous majors and realizes that a "second" major does not reflect a lesser effort or expenditure of resources on the part of either the student or department involved. After a meeting with Kristi Fisher and Lincoln Holmes from the Office of Information Management and Analysis, it was determined that the University does gather data on second and third majors, but that there is no mechanism in place to report more than one major per student to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. In fact, in an effort to increase the four-year graduation rate, the THECB would like to discourage students from declaring second majors. Since the reluctance to recognize multiple majors is a facet of the THECB, it is not clear that the Admissions and Registration Committee has any further role to play in this issue other than to register the opinion that actively discouraging multiple majors could make the University look less attractive to industrious and adventurous students.

The committee also discussed the role of the Graduate and Undergraduate Education Accreditation Boards in identifying low-producing majors at UT. It was reported, that the THECB was comparing UT's criteria for low-producing programs with those of 25 institutions we would not normally consider our peer institutions, such as The University of Alabama. This is worrying because the threshold of what counts as "low-producing" in every one of these institutions is somewhat higher (i.e., a department has to produce more majors to avoid the label) than it is at UT. The elimination of "low-producing" programs leaves other programs as low-hanging fruit for future elimination. As a result of the discussion, it was decided that the committee should express the opinion that all programs should receive more comprehensive evaluation than a head count of primary majors in its annual report, but that, as things stand at the moment, the issue does not fall under the remit of the Admissions and Registration Committee.

Lesley Dean-Jones, chair

### C-2 University Academic Calendar Committee

The calendar committee met as a whole in person twice (September 12 and April 4) during the 2011-12 academic year. The committee considered one item of business this year: the possibility of a fall break. This item continued a discussion that the committee began last year. An undergraduate student government resolution in February 2012 and a graduate student resolution in April 2012 passed in favor of a fall break reinforced the committee's interest. The committee began investigation of the feasibility of such a break by:

- Checking with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to inquire about a waiver to the Common Calendar start date so that we might shift the calendar forward.
- Checking with Division of Housing and Food Service about the timing of summer residence closure

- and fall residence opening to see if we might shift the calendar forward.
- Meeting with student leaders Kori Rady and Bekah Thayer, sponsors of the student resolution, to understand their desires with respect to timing and length of a fall break.
- Receiving from committee member Shelby Stanfield mock-ups of fall calendars through 2019 to investigate issues of timing.
- Via individual emails sent on May 9, 2012, beginning discussions with relevant campus stakeholders (associate deans of schools, Staff Council chair, the heads of campus IT and security, and so forth) to determine the potential impact of such a change on their units. See Appendix A (C-2).

The committee intends to finalize these discussions with relevant campus stakeholders by early fall of the 2012-13 academic year. At that point, we expect to either drop the matter (too many significant negative impacts) or come forward to the Faculty Council with legislation in the fall semester (impacts appear manageable).

The committee voted for Diane Bailey to continue as chair for the 2012-13 academic year.

Diane Bailey, chair

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

The primary work for the Educational Policy Committee for 2011-12 involved recommending to the Faculty Council various changes to the Undergraduate Catalog and the General Information Catalog (GIC). Several other minor matters came to our attention.

One question involving the Course-Instructor Survey (CIS) remains to be considered by next year's committee. As well, policies to improve graduate rates and changes in state requirements for the core curriculum will be on the agenda for next year's committee.

The Educational Policy Committee was busy with changes to the undergraduate core curriculum and other catalogue changes. After serious discussion with proponents and opponents and consultation with experts on peer review in writing, the committee agreed to recommend changing the requirements for the writing flag in the core curriculum. We recommended the removal of the requirement that students read each other's work, although we still urge this as an excellent optional practice (see D 9349-9350).

Additional recommended modifications were:

- Changes in the Dropping a Class Policy for Undergraduate Students in GIC (D 9504)
- Changes in the Adding a Class Policy in GIC (D 9177-9178 and D 9498-9499)
- Changes in the Grades Policy in GIC (D 9176 and D 9496-9497)
- Clarification of the Applicability of ROTC Courses in the Core Curriculum (D 9136)
- The Addition of Minimum Grades for Courses Used in the Core Curriculum (D 9135)
- Clarification of Information about the Transfer of Core Courses from State Public Institutions in the School of Undergraduate Studies (D 9124-9126)
- Revision of the Flag Descriptions in the School of Undergraduate Studies (D 9121-9123)
- Changes in the Deadline to Drop Policy in GIC (D 9500)
- Changes in the Honors Day Policy in GIC (D 9346-9347)
- Changes in the language about the Basic Education Requirements (D 9132-9134)
- Changes in Withdrawal Counseling in GIC (in progress)

State Law now requires that the University establish a deadline of at least 30 days before the first day of classes for faculty members to submit information about required texts. The Educational Policy Committee approved and forwarded to the Faculty Council a resolution affirming this requirement and encouraging faculty to respond to the bookstore requests for earlier notification if possible.

The CIS subcommittee of the Educational Policy Committee considered reviewing the CIS instrument to ask what we wish this tool to achieve. The Senate of College Councils submitted suggestions to revise the standard CIS. Next year's Educational Policy Committee needs to consult with experts on CIS tools to

consider the senate's proposals, as well as the general questions of whether and how we need to revise the CIS.

Tom Garza served as vice chair for 2011-12. Mary Rose was elected chair-elect for 2012-13. The chair for 2011-12 appreciated the very prompt and responsible service of all of the members of the Educational Policy Committee--both elected and *ex officio*.

Janet Staiger, chair

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

During the 2011-12 academic year, the Faculty Building Advisory Committee (FBAC) provided input on several projects, including the Public Art Project proposed for the College of Communication and the Engineering Education and Research Center. Members of the committee also serve on the Campus Master Plan Committee.

FBAC activities declined this year, because the economic downturn adversely affected construction on campus. The Engineering Education and Research Center (EERC) was discussed several times and received enthusiastic support at the conclusion of design development. More than 20 percent of the EERC is devoted to teaching spaces, including classrooms, teaching laboratories, and project space for teams of undergraduate students.

The committee provided advice on the installation of "And That's the Way It Is," Ben Rubin's large-scale visual projection on the south façade of the Jesse H. Jones Communication Center A. The committee believed that the work of art was a good fit for the College of Communication and was a strong addition to the Landmarks Program. The work was unveiled on April 19, 2012, and will be visible every evening from dusk until midnight.

The FBAC continues to promote four priorities:

- The completion of a new Campus Master Plan. The committee believes that a strong plan will save the campus money in the long run and ensure an integrated architectural environment.
- The FBAC remains focused on ensuring that new buildings are sustainable and efficient. Rather than simply seeking a target Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating for new construction, the committee's aim is to reduce the life-cycle costs.
- The FBAC continues focus on increasing the inventory of general-purpose classrooms across campus.
- The FBAC also addresses accessibility issues on campus with a goal of ensuring that all new construction meets the needs of persons with disabilities.

These issues will remain priorities for 2012-13.

Sharon Wood, chair

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

There were no meetings during this academic year.

Michael Johnson, chair

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

The Committee met three times in the fall of 2011 and four times in the spring of 2012. All meetings were held in the PCL conference room. A key component of these meetings was the exchange of information between the UT Libraries administrative staff and C-7 committee members.

One of the main topics discussed by the committee was the library budget. Over the course of several meetings, the administrative staff described the budget situation facing the University and the libraries, presented plans for addressing immediate challenges, and reviewed strategic planning initiatives designed to position the libraries to cope with longer-term issues.

Annual increases in the cost of materials, especially electronic subscriptions, present a continuing financial difficulty. A libraries staff working group was therefore formed to collect data on current collections

practices, and three specialists from varied peer institutions visited campus for two days in March to review these practices with staff. Following their visit, they provided Vice Provost Heath with a report on their findings and recommendations for future directions, which was shared with the committee.

Research university libraries face significant challenges in the near future, including scholarly communications costs, state and national fiscal climates, and technological changes. To ensure that the University libraries remain among the top tier of research university libraries, the UT Libraries administration and staff initiated a strategic planning process designed to address critical issues facing the libraries over the next five years. The committee also learned about libraries development efforts, such as Literary Longhorns and Adopt-a-Book, and was informed of recent bequests.

The escalating costs of scholarly publishing continue to be of concern to the committee, particularly in the area of journal subscriptions. We discussed efforts to manage such costs, and we anticipate a continuation of this conversation next year.

A number of additional topics was discussed during the year. These include remote storage projects, the collaboration between the Benson Latin American Collection (BLAC) and the Teresa Lozano Long Institute of Latin American Studies (LLILAS), space planning issues, digital initiatives and resources, the possible implications for the libraries of a new UT medical school, and the results of Lib-QUAL surveys of students and faculty. The topic of potential partnerships between the libraries and the University of Texas Press was raised, and we anticipate that this will also be discussed next year.

Committee members note the forward-looking manner with which the libraries have prepared for change in multiple areas and appreciate the detailed information presented by Dr. Heath and the staff. The committee also appreciates the support provided by the University administration, especially in the current fiscal climate, and hopes that the University will continue to provide that support if at all possible.

David Leal, 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 2-3-week period. The individual panelists use their UTEID and password to access the web-based site to review the cases. Each case consists of evidence presented by the Parking and Traffic Services administration and the appellant. After reviewing the case, the panelist enters a vote to uphold, reduce or dismiss the fine. The chair 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 4-6 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 200 cases. This compares to 113 cases at this point in time of the 204 total cases reviewed in the previous academic year. The committee will consider new appeals throughout the summer as they are posted to the parking and traffic appeals website.

The committee elected Michelle Habeck as chair for the 2012-13 academic year.

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

Alexandra Garcia, chair

### **C-9 Parking and Traffic Policies Committee**

The committee met in September, October, November, and March and considered the following issues:

#### **Election of co-vice chairs**

Blinda McClelland and Patricia Somers served as co-vice chairs.

#### **Bicycles, scooters and skateboards on campus**

The issue of allowing bicycles, scooters (such as razors) and skateboards on campus took up the bulk of our meeting time. Non-members attended meetings to advocate for rule changes. Both Parking and Transportation staff and the committee want to encourage the use of alternative methods of transportation to UT. Proposed rules are attached (Appendix A).

#### **Parking rate increase**

A parking rate increase was proposed by Parking and Transportation staff as reflected on the attached table (Appendix B). The committee approved the proposed rates with the exception that the O permit prices was to be raised by 5%. The parking rate increase was at most \$1/month for faculty and staff, and there was no increase for students. However, during the summer it became apparent that parking permit availability had changed for some categories affecting costs for some departments. This should be discussed by the committee in the fall.

#### **Election of chair-elect**

Pat Somers was elected to chair the committee for the 2012-13 year.

Betsy Greenberg, chair

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

No report was submitted.

Arturo De Lozanne, chair

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

The committee did not meet during the 2011-12 academic year and did not submit an annual report.

Rebecca Bigler, chair

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

The C-12 committee focused on revising *HOP* sections 12.C.3 and 12.C.4 to address gaps in information about undergraduate student workers (see point 1, below). During the revision process, several gaps in language about graduate students were identified and tabled for discussion/revision in 2012-13 (point 2). Other topics discussed during the year (points 3 and 4) involved requesting information and receiving clarifications from the Graduate School on graduate student benefits and taxation.

1. Undergraduate Student Workers: Last year, a working group was convened by the provost's office to address gaps in *HOP* 12.C.3 and 12.C.4 about appointments of undergraduate students in academic titles. Specifically, the group noted that students in job codes 0066, 0070, and 0095 (tutor, undergraduate assistant, and undergraduate research assistant, respectively) had open issues regarding the following:
- a. enrollment requirements for long semesters and the summer;
  - b. a definition of "good academic standing";
  - c. whether students could work during the summer after graduation;
  - d. mechanism for payment (monthly, hourly); and
  - e. grievance processes.

The C-12 committee discussed the working group's recommendations and implemented them as new language in *HOP* 12.C.3 and 12.C.4. The revisions were submitted to the Faculty Council as no-protest legislation. There were several protests, resulting in further revision and discussion. The final revisions to these *HOP* sections were passed by no-protest vote in May 2012. The committee's revisions focused entirely on sections pertaining to undergraduate workers.

2. Graduate Student Workers: During revision of *HOP* 12.C.3 and 12.C.4 several protests were lodged

about language pertaining to graduate student employment. Because this happened very late in the year, the C-12 committee did not make any revisions to such language, but we have placed it on the agenda as a priority for 2012-13.

**3. Taxation of Graduate Student Tuition:** We requested information from the Graduate School about taxation of graduate student tuition and whether this might be waived. We learned from John Dalton, assistant dean that they were working on this issue. During the course of the year, we received information that a ruling had been made, giving graduate students relief from this taxation requirement. No further action was necessary, as this question was resolved in a satisfactory manner.

**4. Graduate Student Health Insurance:** We asked for some clarifications about the new policy allowing graduate students to purchase UT's group medical insurance plan. We received responses from Marvin Hackert, associate dean, answering our questions about what types of funds can be used for this purpose. No further action was necessary.

Andrea Gore, chair

### **C-13 Information Technology Committee**

The committee met in September, October, November, January, February, March, April and May. The topics considered included the following:

#### **How IT governance works at UT and the current IT goals**

Brad Englert, chief information officer, reviewed the history of IT governance, and the plan and priorities established by the SITAC (Strategic Information Technology Advisory Committee). Recent accomplishments include project funding for LIFT grants to support innovative IT ideas, the opening of a new data storage center, and the selection of Google e-mail. Ongoing work includes the establishment of voice-over Internet Protocol (VoIP) standards and the evaluation of learning management system (LMS) options. Other issues include a lecture capture system, convenient data accessibility for travel, clarity on the responsibilities of ITS, the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), individual college IT departments, a wireless coverage strategy, the availability of cellular service on campus, classroom response systems using mobile devices, and the need to publicize services that are available.

#### **Update on iTunes U**

iTunes U provides free content from schools. In January, the University entered an agreement with Apple and is currently working toward a launch. iTunes U has a public side and private side that needs authentication. CTL is working with the Office of Communications, the Office of Marketing, and the Office of Creative Service to design graphics and layout for the public side. Two hundred pieces of content will be provided by UTeach, Knowledge Matters, and individual colleges. Hopefully, there will be a soft launch on iTunes by the end of this or early next semester. The private side of iTunes works through Blackboard and is currently in beta phase. Apple's system is intended to deliver public content, so the private side is used less. Schools use iTunes U to publicize the best of the best.

#### **Learning Management System selection**

Project details are available at <http://www.utexas.edu/its/course-mgmt/project.php>. Blackboard does not meet everyone's needs, so there was a RFQ for a new learning management system. Surveys, focus groups, and hands-on testing were conducted to get as much input as possible. After reviewing preliminary test results, only two systems were recommended for RFP: Blackboard and Canvas by Instructure. A pilot of the Canvas system will be available in fall 2012. See <https://www.utexas.edu/its/canvas-project/>.

#### **“UTmail powered by Google” rollout and the retirement of the University Mailbox Service (UMBS)**

Throughout the year, the committee was updated on this topic. The number of @utexas.edu (Google) accounts has increased as the service became available first to students, then to alumni, and finally to faculty and staff. In parallel accounts have been removed from UMBS. The @mail.utexas.edu address continues to be available to faculty for forwarding or as an alias. Student workers and retirees will have their accounts retired June 4. Staff accounts will retire in mid summer and faculty accounts will be retired by about mid-October.

### **Laptop encryption**

The executive compliance committee (president, vice president, and deans) considers the risks on campus. At the start of the year, laptops fell into low control/high risk. Laptop encryption has been ongoing since January 2011. At the start of the academic year, 51% of the 15,000 UT-owned laptops were still not protected. Crashplan was rolled out, which may have helped motivate individuals to have their laptops encrypted. By the end of the academic year, more than 85% of University-owned laptops had been encrypted.

### **Lecture capturing**

The committee was informed about what is being done in the Colleges of Pharmacy and Liberal Arts. Issues, such as student privacy, were discussed. If lectures are recorded, departments could put together a library of lectures. Another side effect is that events can be made global using this technology. Putting Media Site or Echo 360 into the 60 or 80 largest classrooms would cost \$1-2 million. This would represent about 90% of the credit hours. Very small cost per credit/hour. The systems capture whatever is on the projector and audio from the professors' mike. Some faculty would like the talking head, but so far Liberal Arts does not include that. Technology is improving and will allow searching for topics and captioning (although captioning is expensive).

### **Mobile strategy**

People are bringing more and more mobile devices to campus. Some are coming to campus with two or three devices. There are 61,000 wireless devices hooked to the network every day. UT needs to develop a mobile strategy. Surveys, interviews, and focus groups will be used to deal with these questions. Some classroom response systems need wireless. A multi-year plan is needed to plan which rooms have adequate wireless. The new Liberal Arts building will have adequate wireless. About 40 interviews have been conducted to date. People report that they are using their mobile devices to connect with e-mail, calendar, maps, news, social media, notes, efficiency apps, and entertainment apps. Students want the software to function the same on mobile devices as on computers. Bandwidth growth on wireless was 80% over last year. More wireless access points are needed, which depends on college/department priorities.

### **Administrative system master plan**

Every year, UT spends \$25 million on administrative systems. SITAC recommended that there be a plan, so all the business areas got together to come up with a new strategy. Group decided to move away from database Natural, which needs an IBM mainframe to run. An interfacing architecture is needed to connect the Oracle open environment to the mainframe. This can either be package software, hosted systems, or, when necessary, custom development. ITS will work with the Architecture and Infrastructure Committee to develop a roadmap for replacing the old systems. Carnegie Mellon has a capability maturity model, which rates UT at the lowest level.

### **Voice-over IP**

UT has 23,000 lines of copper that hook to a 25-year-old switch that connects to phones. Voice-over IP is expensive to tie into the University's switches. Voice-over IP can route to a mobile phone during the day or connect to a computer. This will reduce costs. We need to stop using the switches because they aren't made anymore, and the service building space will be repurposed in six years. Two to three thousand lines need to be copper for safety. Eventually, cost will be about one fourth for VoIP instead of copper. Phones will be moved when computers are moved. Currently, ITS overcharges for phone service and uses this money to fund other things. Six options were considered and two bids are currently considered. The transition from copper to VoIP will take five years. All new buildings will get VoIP service, and then the other buildings will be filled in. Sound quality will be better and voice mail will be bundled in. FTE tax may just cover the costs and then bills won't need to be required. Long distance US, Canada, and Mexico will be free. The copper from the old lines will be recycled.

### **Classroom response systems**

The Center for Teaching and Learning and ITS did an evaluation of classroom response systems – particularly browser-based systems that allow for a variety of question types. The four systems considered were chime.in, Learning Catalytics, Top Hat Monicle, and TOWRE. Learning Catalytics is available for the 2012-13 school year for free.

**Cloud file sharing**

Dropbox and Webspaces are currently being used. Cloud file sharing taskforce is trying to see how we could get something better. Security, networking are issues. Students use Google docs (80-90% of students), USB drives, and e-mail files to themselves. Sharing and collaboration would be easier if there was a good way to share files. A survey was circulated to get some indication of what's going on. It was determined that not many people store more than what they can for free. People expect Cloud file sharing to be free. Company called Box provides solution that committee will recommend. There is a cost, initial buy-in is \$200,000 for 200 Terabytes. Accessibility and e-mail logins are concerns. Faculty want the service to be competitive with Dropbox. Students use Google docs. Google Drive will be available because it is included in the Google Apps for Education agreement.

**Planning for 2012-13**

Paul Resta was approved unanimously to serve as chair elect. The issue of increasing student and faculty participation in C-13 was raised. The committee is supposed to bring forward the faculty perspective/faculty voice. This is a key place where faculty voice should be more broadly heard. Where there are college or school faculty technology committees, there should be representation on C-13. Seven or eight faculty members are not going to be able to represent issues for everyone. A motion to add more faculty representation to the committee was passed two years ago, but not acted on. This should be pursued again. Currently, the committee gets reports and occasionally gives recommendations to ITS, but doesn't really make decisions. It may be helpful to have a representative who is on both C-13 and the Learning and Technology committee. It was also suggested that the C-13 committee design and conduct a survey to see what technology needs would be desirable on campus. The survey is a project that might get the committee more engaged.

**IT priorities for next fiscal year**

Cloud file sharing  
 Lecture capture  
 Classroom response system  
 Library and e-content  
 Learning analytics  
 Teaching from the tablet  
 Sharing of things developed from Course Transformation  
 Blended/online learning – tools, instructional design  
 Overall – focus on instructional technology

Betsy Greenberg, chair

## Appendix A (A-1)

**Appendix A: Guidelines for Filing a Procedural Claim About a Promotion Case**

The process of submitting a request for review of a promotion case to the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CCAFR) for compliance with University procedures and commonly accepted professional standards is described in Section D.3 in the *General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*. The deadline is the later of January 31 or six weeks after the faculty was officially notified of denial of promotion. Commonly accepted professional standards include those adopted by the American Association of University Professors ([www.aaup.org](http://www.aaup.org)). The 1940 AAUP tenets of academic freedom are given in Appendix B.

The provost's office issues the University *General Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*:  
<http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/>

From the fall 2012 version, we highlight 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 female faculty member may extend the tenure probationary period by one year for each child born or adopted, up to a maximum of two years of extension. When the assistant professor is evaluated by the university or by external reviewers, the review should treat all of the faculty member's work as being completed in the typical five-year period.*
- 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 also item (e).*
- e. Review of associate professors with tenure in rank for 10+ years. (Section A.4)  
*Associate professors with tenure have a right to be evaluated for promotion by their department after completing 10 years in rank, and if denied, every five years thereafter.*
- 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: An annual evaluation in writing would help the 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 very helpful when there is a change in department chairs during a faculty member's promotion period.*

## Appendix B (A-1)

**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.*

## Appendix A (A-2)

Appendix A: **FACB letter to UT Deans**

22 February 2012

UT Academic Deans:

Now that the awarding of FRAs, SRAs, and Graduate Fellowships has devolved from the UT Graduate School to the college/school deans, the Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets (FACB) is reviewing the implementation of the necessary new policies and procedures. The President has asked the deans to include faculty in the unit-level decision-making committees that will establish the new processes and determine awards. As the faculty budgetary oversight committee responsible to the President, the FACB is requesting information from you as to how you intend to accomplish this faculty involvement. We will be working with the President to ensure that all deans create faculty-involvement models for their colleges/schools that have the support of their faculty.

We are aware of many of the challenges created by this new system, and that each school and college will need to find ways of accomplishing this task at least as well as the Graduate School did. We know, for example, that the Graduate School kept records of overall graduate-student acceptances and rejections, and so could allocate funds appropriately. If you think that we can be helpful in providing advice and information, please don't hesitate to contact us. We also urge your cooperation with the recently created joint committee of the Graduate Assembly and Faculty Council Executive Committees. Its task is to examine the circumstances and rationale for the new arrangement and to monitor the implementation of the Graduate School devolution.

We look forward to learning how you are implementing the changes in your school or college, how you are involving your faculty, and what, if anything, we can do to help. Please keep us informed as you go forward.

Best regards.



Hillary Hart, chair  
*Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets*

Friedman, Alan W.

[Friesen, Steven J.](#)

[Gore, Andrea C.](#)

[Hillis, David M.](#)

[Holladay, Joan](#)

[Immroth, Barbara F.](#)

[McDaniel, Reuben](#)

[Neikirk, Dean P.](#)

[Rivas-Rodriguez, Maggie R.](#)

[Svinicki, Marilla D.](#)

[Deitrick, James W.](#)

[Kinney, Kerry A.](#)

## Appendix B (A-2)

Appendix B: **FACB letter to Graduate Dean Langlois**

22 February, 2012

Dean Judith Langlois  
 Graduate School  
 The University of Texas at Austin  
 Austin, Texas

Dear Dean Langlois:

I am writing this letter on behalf of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets. Among other concerns, our committee is very interested in providing feedback and advice to the Administration on the financial status of the graduate students who work as TAs, AIs, or GRAs for the University or have fellowships from the University or elsewhere. With times becoming so difficult and home budgets so tight, we feel an obligation to look out for the welfare of our graduate students, as I am sure you do as well. Before we feel ready to make recommendations for the budget, we need to inform ourselves about the status of the finances of these students, who derive so much of their income from assistantships and fellowships from the University. So we are coming to the Graduate School as the office that has the most information and direct concern for these matters.

Specifically we are interested in finding out your take on the following questions that have come up in our discussions so far. I realize that some of these answers may require data collection, so let us know that too.

1. Which graduate funding mechanisms (TA, GRA, and AI appointments, fellowships) include benefits, such as tuition remission, health benefits and so on?
2. How much would it cost (units or the University) to provide health benefits to those fellowship recipients who do not currently receive them? To TAs, AIs or GRAs? Per student (as an average) and totally? We are especially concerned about the message UT sends by not accompanying many external (and often very prestigious) fellowships with health benefits.
3. What would be the tax consequences to the student of UT providing these benefits?
4. What is the tax consequence of tuition remission for those who receive it?
5. Is there any legal or University policy that would prevent us from simply waiving tuition for these various categories of graduate students, as is done in so many of our competitor institutions? It would be a great help in recruiting the best students.

We believe you share our concern about the welfare of these students, who are such a big part of the University's community and its mission. If there is any other policy issue along these lines that you are concerned about and with which we can help, please let us know.

And, finally, congratulations on your new appointment. We look forward to working with you on these and other issues.

Sincerely,



Hillary Hart, chair  
*Faculty Advisory Committee on Budgets*

Friedman, Alan W.

[Friesen, Steven J.](#)

[Gore, Andrea C.](#)

[Hillis, David M.](#)

[Holladay, Joan](#)

[Immroth, Barbara F.](#)

[McDaniel, Reuben](#)

[Neikirk, Dean P.](#)

[Rivas-Rodriguez, Maggie R.](#)

[Svinicki, Marilla D.](#)

[Deitrick, James W.](#)

[Kinney, Kerry A.](#)

## Appendix A (C-2)

Last	First	Role/Title	Unit	email
Associate or Assistant Deans of Student Affairs or Related Areas in Schools and Colleges				
Bernstein	Mark	Associate Dean for Student Affairs	College of Communication	<a href="mailto:mark.bernstein@austin.utexas.edu">mark.bernstein@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Flores	Richard	Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs	College of Liberal Arts	<a href="mailto:rrflores@austin.utexas.edu">rrflores@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Gore	Patricia	Assistant Dean for Student Affairs	Cockrell School of Engineering	<a href="mailto:tgore@mail.utexas.edu">tgore@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Field	Sherry	Associate Dean for Teacher Education, Student Affairs, and Administration	College of Education	<a href="mailto:sherry_field@mail.utexas.edu">sherry_field@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Hale	Kenneth	Senior Associate Dean	College of Fine Arts	<a href="mailto:Ken_hale@mail.utexas.edu">Ken_hale@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Kopp	Sacha	Associate Dean for Curriculum and Programs	College of Natural Sciences	<a href="mailto:kopp@hep.utexas.edu">kopp@hep.utexas.edu</a>
Davis	Pat	Senior Associate Dean, Academic Affairs	College of Pharmacy	<a href="mailto:davispj@mail.utexas.edu">davispj@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Kahn	Terry	Associate Dean, Graduate Student Services	Graduate School	<a href="mailto:tkahn@austin.utexas.edu">tkahn@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Bennett	Philip	Associate Dean, Academic Affairs	Jackson School of Geosciences	<a href="mailto:pbennett@mail.utexas.edu">pbennett@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Stolp	Chandler	Associate Dean, Academic Affairs	LBJ School of Public Affairs	<a href="mailto:stolp@mail.utexas.edu">stolp@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Newman	Paul	Senior Associate Dean	McCombs School of Business	<a href="mailto:paul.newman@mcombs.utexas.edu">paul.newman@mcombs.utexas.edu</a>
Oden	Michael	Associate Dean, Research and Operations	School of Architecture	<a href="mailto:oden@mail.utexas.edu">oden@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Doty	Philip	Associate Dean	School of Information	<a href="mailto:pdoty@ischool.utexas.edu">pdoty@ischool.utexas.edu</a>
Ramos	Ray	Assistant Dean, Student Affairs	School of Law	<a href="mailto:rramos@law.utexas.edu">rramos@law.utexas.edu</a>
Carpenter	Linda	Assistant Dean, Student Affairs	School of Nursing	<a href="mailto:lcarpenter@mail.nur.utexas.edu">lcarpenter@mail.nur.utexas.edu</a>
Schwab	James	Associate Dean and Graduate Advisor	School of Social Work	<a href="mailto:jimschwab@austin.utexas.edu">jimschwab@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Abraham	Lawrence	Associate Dean	School of Undergraduate Studies	<a href="mailto:l.abraham@austin.utexas.edu">l.abraham@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Raney	Mike	Assistant Dean, Chair of the Assistant Deans Committee	College of Natural Sciences	<a href="mailto:mraney@mail.utexas.edu">mraney@mail.utexas.edu</a>

Other Administrators				
Leslie	Steven	Provost	Administration	<a href="mailto:sleslie@mail.utexas.edu">sleslie@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Reagins-Lilly	Soncia	Senior Associate Vice President for Student Affairs	Office of the Dean of Students	<a href="mailto:soncia.r.lilly@austin.utexas.edu">soncia.r.lilly@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Gonzalez	Juan	Vice President for Student Affairs	Student Affairs	<a href="mailto:juan.gonzalez@austin.utexas.edu">juan.gonzalez@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Martinez	Marla	Associate Vice President, University Operations	University Operations	<a href="mailto:marla.martinez@austin.utexas.edu">marla.martinez@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Kress	Debra	Associate Vice President, Human Resources	University Operations	<a href="mailto:debra.kress@austin.utexas.edu">debra.kress@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Kraal	Steven	Senior Associate Vice President, Campus Planning and Facilities Management	University Operations	<a href="mailto:sakraal@mail.utexas.edu">sakraal@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Harkins	Bob	Associate Vice President, Campus Safety and Security	University Operations	<a href="mailto:bharkins@austin.utexas.edu">bharkins@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Aebersold	Liz	Director	ITS Communication and Strategy Management	<a href="mailto:stratcom@its.utexas.edu">stratcom@its.utexas.edu</a>
Thomas	Theresa	President, Executive committee	Academic Counselors Association	<a href="mailto:theresa.thomas@austin.utexas.edu">theresa.thomas@austin.utexas.edu</a>
Frahm	Erika	Chair	Staff Council	<a href="mailto:chair@utsc.utexas.edu">chair@utsc.utexas.edu</a>
Dodds	DeLoss	Athletics Director	Men's Athletics	<a href="mailto:ddodds@mail.utexas.edu">ddodds@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Plonsky	Christine	Athletics Director	Women's Athletics	<a href="mailto:chris.plonsky@athletics.utexas.edu">chris.plonsky@athletics.utexas.edu</a>
Friedman	Alan	Chair	Faculty Council	<a href="mailto:friedman@mail.utexas.edu">friedman@mail.utexas.edu</a>
Hilley	Martha	Chair Elect	Faculty Council	<a href="mailto:mphilley@mail.utexas.edu">mphilley@mail.utexas.edu</a>

## Appendix A (C-9)

Proposed rule changes

**12. Skateboard, Roller-Skates (inline and others) and Scooters:**

Skateboards, skates and scooters shall be allowed to operate on in campus in areas where a bicycle is permitted. Skateboards and skates must yield to pedestrians at all times. Skateboards and skates shall comply with all stop signs, yield signs, and other official traffic control devices and not exceed posted speed limits when traveling on campus. Skateboard and scooter users must exercise caution to prevent injury to oneself and others.

- A. Skateboards, skates and scooters shall be used as a form of transportation only. The use of skateboards, skates or scooters is prohibited within any building on the UT Austin campus or on any surface features including:
  - sidewalks
  - garages
  - staircases and steps
  - handrails
  - flower planters
  - ramps
  - or any other architectural improvement
  
- B. It is prohibited for any skateboard, roller-skate, scooter or user to engage in trick riding on campus. Trick riding is defined as any type of movement where the wheels of the skateboard, in-line or roller skates, or scooter are deliberately removed from contact with the surface in a repetitive procedure.

**17. Scooter**

Every non-motorized device consisting of two or more wheels affixed to a platform or footboard upon which a rider stands and which has a handle or other mechanism for holding or guiding the device. It does not include mopeds, whether operated with or without motor power (see Motorcycle/Moped/Motor Scooters).

**18. Skateboard:**

Every non-motorized device consisting of two or more wheels affixed to a platform or footboard upon which a rider stands and which does not have steering capability similar to that of a bicycle or brakes, which operate on or upon the wheels of the skateboard. It also includes every device generally recognized as a skateboard.

**11. Bicycles, Low-Powered Electrical Bicycles, Scooters (non-motorized/Razor type) and EPAMDS:**

Employees, students, and visitors of the university are required to display the appropriate PTS permit on their bicycle, scooter, or low-powered electrical bicycle.

- A. Bicycle, EPAMDS, and scooter riding is prohibited in all university parking garages, except to access authorized bicycle parking areas.
- B. On all university streets and property, operators of bicycles, scooters and EPAMDs shall comply with all stop signs, yield signs, and other official traffic control devices with the exception that they may proceed in either direction on Inner Campus Drive and on Trinity Street between Robert Dedman Drive and 23rd Street.
- C. Bicycles, scooters, and EPAMDs must be operated in accordance with and conform to local, state, and federal regulations.
- D. It is prohibited to operate a bicycle, scooter or EPAMD on the campus in a manner that jeopardizes pedestrian safety, and/or university or private property.
- E. All scooters (non-motorized) may park at bike racks only and are subject to the same parking regulations as bicycles.

- F. Riding bicycles, scooters or electrical assisted bicycles upon or along sidewalks shall not be permitted except:
1. where the sidewalk is part of a designated bicycle path; or
  2. when the operator or rider is preparing to dismount and park the bicycle or electrical assisted bicycle at a location on the block on which the bicycle or electrical assisted bicycle is being operated, or the operator has just mounted and has not yet crossed a street or alley.

## Appendix B (C-9)

PTS Proposed Rates for FY12-13								
Permit	FY07-08	FY08-09	FY09-10	FY10-11	FY11-12	FY12-13	% Change	Annual \$ Change
"R" Summer	\$225	\$170	\$131	\$131	\$131	\$131	0.00%	0
"S" Summer	\$131	\$131	\$131	\$131	\$131	\$131	0.00%	0
"AN" Surface only	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$30	\$30	0.00%	0
"AN" Garage	\$60	\$60	\$60	\$60	\$60	\$60	0.00%	0
"N" ** (Changed 9/10)	\$60	\$60	\$36	\$36	\$36	\$36	0.00%	0
"N+" ** (New 09-10)	XX	XX	\$60	\$60	\$60	\$60	0.00%	0
"C+"	\$170	\$170	\$170	\$175	\$180	\$180	0.00%	0
"F99", "F21", "O"	\$744	\$775	\$775	\$775	\$775	\$798	2.97%	\$23
"S" Annual	\$576	\$602	\$602	\$602	\$602	\$602	0.00%	0
"S" Fall/ Spring	\$275	\$287	\$287	\$287	\$287	\$287	0.00%	0
"R" Annual- BRG/ TSG	\$711	\$743	\$743	\$743	\$743	\$743	0.00%	0
"R" Annual- SWG/ SAG/ SJG/TRG	\$675	\$705	\$705	\$705	\$705	\$705	0.00%	0
"R" Annual- MAG/ GUG	\$648	\$677	\$677	\$677	\$677	\$677	0.00%	0
"R" Fall/ Spring- BRG/ TSG	\$395	\$413	\$413	\$413	\$413	\$413	0.00%	0
"R" Fall/ Spring- SWG/ SAG/ SJG/TRG	\$375	\$392	\$392	\$392	\$392	\$392	0.00%	0
"R" Fall/ Spring- MAG/ GUG	\$360	\$376	\$376	\$376	\$376	\$376	0.00%	0
"F" Permit (surface)*	\$444	\$464	\$464	\$464	\$464	\$476	2.59%	\$12
"A"	\$132	\$138	\$138	\$138	\$138	\$142	2.90%	\$4
"C"	\$110	\$110	\$110	\$115	\$120	\$120	0.00%	0
"M"	\$66	\$66	\$66	\$69	\$72	\$72	0.00%	0
"F" Permit	\$384	\$408	\$408	\$408	\$408	\$420	2.94%	\$12
"E" **	\$100	\$108	\$108	\$108	\$108	\$120	11.11%	\$12
Garage Daily Rate / 24 hour Rate	\$7	\$8	\$10/	\$12 / \$18	\$12 / \$18	\$12 / \$18		
Departmental Rate	\$4	\$4	\$5	\$6	\$6	\$7	16.67%	
Permit nmaes Isited in Red are either Faculty/Staff permits or Non-Afflaited Permits								
* No increase to the F98 permit price based on last years \$144 per year rise in cost								
** Permit issued to non-UT affiliates with Rec Sports memberships								